

Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XXII

APRIL, 1940

NUMBER 2

THE ECUMENICAL CHURCH IN TIME OF WAR

By SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT

General Secretary

The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America

The fact that the word "ecumenical" is coming back into the vocabulary of the Church is a happy sign of the times. A decade ago it was used only by a few scholars in ivory towers of cloistered erudition. So far as most Christians were concerned, "ecumenical" was like an ancient coin which had passed out of circulation. Today it is being reminted and coming back into the currency of the realm. It is not, perhaps, a medium of everyday exchange, like a nickel or a copper; it is more like a precious gold piece, which we may not use often but which, for certain high purposes, has no substitute.

If you try to look for a popular, easily understood alternative you begin to appreciate the rich overtones of the word ecumenical. The Greek *oikumene* implied two things: either a household, taken as a whole, or the inhabited earth. The adjective ecumenical accordingly suggests both the unity of a family and a world-wide geographical extent. As an English equivalent, applied to the Church, the term "universal" is only partially adequate, for, while it asserts a world-wide sweep, it does not suggest the oneness

of a single family. When we speak of the Church as ecumenical, we are thinking of both unity and universality; we are implying that there is *one body of Christ throughout the world*.

The unity which belongs to the Church conceived as ecumenical is not a fabricated unity, not something achieved by fitting separate pieces together like the beams and rafters of a lifeless building. As in a family, there is an original solidarity which is part of the very genius of the Church. Just as the family remains an organic unit even though its members may be estranged and separated, so also with the Church. However divided it may become due to historical circumstances, there is an essential unity which remains by virtue of its having a single source of life. This at once suggests why the adjective "international" can never take the place of "ecumenical" as descriptive of the Church. The term international accepts the division of mankind into independent nations as a natural state of affairs and looks toward the establishment of some sort of cooperation between them. The term ecumenical, on the other hand, assumes a *given* unity, a unity which lies at the heart of the Church because it is the continuing embodiment of its one Lord. This initial unity, arising from the one fountain-head, continues as a basic reality even though the churches carry on their work as separated denominations in separated nations. In the Church the ultimate fact (as the message of the Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State declares) is that "the source of unity is not the consenting movement of men's wills; it is Jesus Christ whose one life flows through the Body and subdues the many wills to His."

So neither "universal" nor "international" can take the place of the word "ecumenical." The term "catholic" may ultimately do so, for it clearly suggests both world-wide extent and wholeness, but it has, unfortunately, become popularly identified with a certain exclusive ecclesiastical organization which denies the true nature of other great parts of the Body of Christ. We are left with the conclusion that the word ecumenical is so precious in its wealth of meaning and—at least for the present—so greatly

superior to any other coin of the realm that we must bring it back into current circulation.

Christian ecumenicity is not to be confused with a cosmopolitanism which would reduce the different heritages of the Church to a colorless uniformity. As the family is one although within it there are differences of temperament and gifts, so also is the Church. Its unity is a unity in diversity. It affords room, therefore, for all the great strains that have entered into making Christianity a symphonic whole—

- the Lutheran faithful adherence to an historic revelation;
- the Presbyterian emphasis on the sovereignty of God;
- the Episcopal vision of the central importance of the Church;
- the Baptist stress upon personal regeneration and the conscious relation of the mature soul to its Lord;
- the Congregational concern for liberty;
- the Methodist witness to the personal experience of the saving grace of Christ;
- the Quaker openness to the Inner Light;
- the Eastern Orthodox treasure of a mystical apprehension of Christ;
- the Roman Catholic historic tradition, with its glorious company of saints and martyrs.

The ecumenical spirit neither excludes nor underestimates any of these; it rather treats them all as involved in an organic whole and makes every individual Christian a sharer in the entire Christian heritage of the centuries.

This ecumenical unity has unique significance not only for the relation of Christians to one another but also for the relation of the Church to the unity of mankind. In this aspect of its meaning there is no better interpretation of the ecumenical Church than the oft-quoted words from the *Epistle to Diognetus*, written by an unknown author in the second century after Christ. After picturing the members of the Church as widely scattered in different cities, he boldly declares that they "hold the world together." "What the soul is to the body," he says, "that are

Christians in the world. For the soul holds the body together and Christians hold the world together. This illustrious position has been assigned to them of God which it were unlawful for them ever to forsake."

Now if the Church has the unity of an organic life and that life is as wide as the creation of God, the Church becomes the symbol of the unity of the human race. In a day when a disruptive nationalism, a sundering racialism and a social stratification are splitting the world apart, the Church stands, as no other institution stands or can stand, for the oneness of mankind. It stands for unity not merely as an ideal which may one day be attained, but as an actuality, grounded in the nature of reality itself. The authentic voice of the Church is therefore a unifying voice, never the voice of a segment of humanity set over against other segments. How clear this becomes when the voice of the Church is contrasted with other voices that today bid for the loyalty of men! Hitler says, "If any man is not of German blood, he cannot belong to my kingdom." Mussolini says, "If any man is not an Italian nationalist, he cannot belong to my kingdom." Stalin says, "If any man is not of the proletariat, he cannot belong to my kingdom." All divisive voices, shivering the world to pieces! But through the Church sounds another voice, sometimes hardly more than a feeble echo yet never lost, whose great word is not race or nation or class, but *man*. Here there is a witness to a Kingdom into which "whosoever will" may come—may come simply because he knows himself to be a member of the one family of God.

We have often preached that the Church *ought* to be the bond of unity holding mankind together, but we need to assert the deeper truth that it *is*. If this sounds at first like theoretical theology, divorced from all empirical realities, we may bring the whole matter down from the clouds to earth by asking what other institution or force gives evidence today of being able to unite mankind.

We used to think that *science* and scientific education would do so. Man's mastery over nature was at last enabling the whole

planet to be a single community. The airplane was making all people into near neighbors and the radio was to disseminate universal enlightenment and good will. But today the airplane turns out to be equally an instrument of more extensive destruction; and the radio, over a great part of the earth, is a medium for a propaganda of narrow nationalism. As some clever scientist has put it, "The super-man of science created the airplane and the radio but the ape-man has got hold of them." Science, it is now sadly clear, is morally neutral; it provides marvellous techniques which may be used to disrupt as well as to unite.

We used to think that *trade* would bind the world together. Enlightened self-interest was to lead to ever-enlarging commercial intercourse and make all the peoples so interdependent that a new sense of international unity would arise almost inevitably. But now we begin to discover that economic factors are terrific forces making for war. Nation after nation even adopts the principle of shutting up its economic processes within its own borders, and a strange new word, "autarchy" (stranger than "ecumenical" and embodying an antithetical idea), comes into use to describe the practice of economic self-containment and isolation. Nothing is more quixotic today than to assume that trade, in itself, will unite the world.

We used to pin our hope for world unity to a new *political* structure. Utopian idealists talked of the League of Nations as if it meant the coming of the Kingdom of God to earth. But today the League appears as a hollow skeleton with no quickening spirit to animate its frame.

Over against this scene of tragic disintegration, look now at the Christian Church. It has actually become a world community of men of every race and nation. It is rooted in the soil of all the great countries of the earth. To be a member of a Christian congregation is not to belong to a merely local or an American thing but to one community of faith and life with Kagawa and his Japanese peasants, with T. Z. Koo and his Chinese students, with Nicholas Berdyaev and his Russian exiles, with Pastor Niemoeller and the faithful members of the Confessional Movement in Ger-

many, with Jacques Maritain and French Christians both Protestant and Catholic, with the Archbishop of York and J. H. Oldham in England, with Bishop Aulen and Adolf Keller and Hendrik Kraemer in Sweden and Switzerland and Holland, with Professor Jabavu and Bantu Christians in Africa, and with a great multitude of humble men and women everywhere who know themselves to be one at the deepest level of their lives.

The Church, then, is a world community, not only in its New Testament genius but, to a remarkable degree, as a present observable fact. We can go further and point out that there is no other world community today which can be compared with the Church as a world-wide historical phenomenon. As an empirical social institution it transcends nation and race in its membership more fully than any other. It is not too much to say that the Church, despite its denominational and national divisions, is the one living, growing world community on earth today.

The fact that the Church is a world community today is, of course, the achievement of the foreign missionary movement. At the same time when the process of making the world a physical neighborhood has been going on, another process, in the Providence of God, has been bringing men around the globe into a spiritual fellowship centering in the universal Christ. So no one who cherishes the vision of an ecumenical Church can afford to be lukewarm toward foreign missions. We have the beginnings of an ecumenical Church as an actual fact today only because of what the missionary movement has done in planting the Church in all parts of the earth. We can see the ecumenical nature of the Church come to full flower only as we strengthen the world Christian mission. Moreover, we ourselves need the missionary movement in order to keep Christianity true to its universality and to prevent it from being debased by nationalism. At a time when Christians are wanting to know what they can do to build a new international order which will be a political expression of ecumenical Christianity we must make them see that the most basic thing, and a thing which even the humblest can do, is to support

the world mission of the Church and to strengthen the greatest universal fellowship that exists today.

This remark may sound naive at first but it goes to the core of the whole problem of war and peace. For the ultimate necessity for a new world order is the development of a common body of moral convictions—of what (for lack of a better term) we may call an “international ethos.” So long as each state is a law unto itself, so long as it is conscious of no duty to the people of other nations, no true world order can exist. So long, for example, as Americans feel free to make any immigration laws they please, regardless of their effect on the Japanese; or to fix the price of silver without thought as to what it may do to the Chinese; or to impose any tariff whatever without concern for its consequences to the Filipinos, so long we shall have no lasting peace. To develop in all nations a deeper sense of universal fellowship, of international solidarity, of regard for each other's needs, is a *sine qua non* of a new world order. But no such spirit of mutuality can be fostered on the basis of exclusive loyalty to a nation. There must be a supra-national loyalty and there must be supra-national norms and standards. Whence are such supra-national loyalties and standards to come, unless there can be some universal frame-of-reference, such as is involved in the recognition of God as the Lord of all nations? And how is such a consciousness of a universal moral sovereignty to be created except through the experience of a universal fellowship in the Christian Gospel and in the Church which has that Gospel as its charter?

But we have to face the question whether the ecumenical Church, which we have pictured as the hope of world unity, is not itself one of the casualties of the war. Does its ecumenical outlook really hold in this war-year of 1940? Is the Church in any degree still One Body, a universal fellowship? Or is it “forsaking its illustrious position” of holding the world together, broken into isolated nationalistic sects?

To these questions a full answer cannot yet be given. It is being evolved in these fateful days. But there are indications that the answer may be a happier one than was made when the last

war came. Viewed externally, the churches are doubtless in a weaker condition than in 1914. In Russia they are subjected to public scorn and humiliation; in Germany they face a subtle undermining. What has happened in Eastern Europe even during the last few months is a tragedy far greater than has yet sunk into our consciousness. Churches that flourished in Poland six months ago are utterly scattered. The Evangelical Church in Galicia and the Ukraine has been turned over to a Bolshevist tyranny. The Lutheran Church of Finland—98 per cent. of the population—stands on the edge of the abyss. It may even be that churches which not long ago claimed millions of adherents will, for many years, be dissolved into little congregations where the "two or three" gather in the name of Christ and keep their candles burning in modern catacombs.

Yet from the standpoint of the inner life of the Church, more especially of Protestantism, a star of hope is shining which was absent from the sky of 1914. Then the Church was not consciously a world community; in 1940 the spirit of an ecumenical fellowship is here and a structure to express the new spirit is in the making. Because of this the Church is better prepared to withstand the disrupting effects of war. In spite of national and denominational separations the churches today know something of *the Church*, the *Una Sancta*, and experience some real measure of Christian communion which cannot be broken even by war.

Although war has arrived before the projected World Council of Churches has come fully into being, it has at least a preliminary organization which includes representatives not only of the neutral peoples but also of the peoples whose governments are at war. Its secretariat at the headquarters in Geneva includes churchmen of three neutral nations and also of both Germany and England. In 1914 all contacts between the churches of countries at war were broken, but now the channels of communication between the different branches of the Church are being kept open. That is something new in the history both of Protestantism and of the Eastern Orthodox faith.

No doubt there will be many lapses and failures in preserving

this new sense of world fellowship but we may take hope from evidence already at hand. Two documents which have come out of the early weeks of the war are illustrative of the new spirit. One is a letter from a German pastor to an English colleague in the ecumenical movement. He writes these moving words:

"With these lines I have to say farewell. We expect to be called for military service. What this means for men like ourselves, who have been blessed in these years by friendship and trust, by fellowship and love of Christians all over the world, that cannot be expressed in words. . . . We have to go the way into darkness . . . (but) I shall remain a man of the Christian mission in spite of all that may come upon us during the years ahead."

The other illustrative document is an article in *The British Weekly*, entitled "The Kingdom That Cannot Be Shaken." After saying that he sees no alternative except to engage with a heavy heart in what he calls "the devil's business" the writer sounds an unmistakably ecumenical note when he adds:

"From our fellow-Christians in enemy countries we are at present cut off, so far as it is given to man to cut us off. But what kind of friends are they whom we cannot trust out of our sight? We must not sin against the Body of Christ by forgetting or denying that our fellow-Christians in enemy countries are praying with us and for us every day, that they are feeling, as we are, the hideousness of war, that they are holding up, as they are able, the standard of Christ, and that the fellowship of the Church Universal holds in spite of war."

Listen, finally, to this testimony from the Christians of sixty nations at the Madras Conference in December, 1938, at a time when war had come to the Far East and Europe was in a war psychology:

"Our nations are at war with one another; but we know ourselves brethren in the community of Christ's Church. Our people increase in suspicion and fear of one another; but we are learning to trust each other more deeply through common devotion to one Lord of us all. . . . Thus, in broken and imperfect fashion, the Church is even now fulfilling its calling to be within itself a foretaste of the redeemed family of God which He has purposed humanity to be."

If such a vision of the ecumenical Church can be maintained, we shall have hope of becoming visibly One Body of Christ throughout the world and of making men see in His Church the final secret of the unity of mankind.

DIVORCE AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

By BURTON SCOTT EASTON

General Theological Seminary

I

In both the Jewish and the Graeco-Roman worlds marriage was regarded not as a civic but as a purely private and individual rite. There were no marriage licenses and no public marriage registers; and no civil or religious functionary officiated at marriages, which were exclusively the affair of the parties concerned. To be sure, certain unions, like those within prohibited degrees, were forbidden; if such were contracted they could be ordered dissolved. If questions arose about property rights, appeal could be made to the courts as in all questions about disputed property; it was on such appeals that problems of legitimacy were settled. If a minor contracted a marriage without his father's consent, the latter could invoke the civil power to annul the union. But apart from such incidental problems the authorities did not and could not interfere.

Under Jewish law the woman was still regarded primarily as property. She did not "marry" her husband but was "given in marriage" to him by her father or guardian; a terminology respected by Christ (Matt. 24.38, etc.). No priest, elder or Rabbi took any part in the wedding ceremony, which consisted simply of the groom's public appropriation of his bride; to this day in Orthodox Judaism the essential "form" of marriage is "I take thee to wife after the manner of the sons and daughters of the children of Israel," the bride saying nothing. In the Graeco-Roman world, however, woman's status was more advanced and the consent of both parties was required—that, but nothing else.

This conception of the marriage ceremony as a purely private matter was maintained in Christianity to a much later date than

is commonly realized. In Ignatius the consent of the bishop is required before a marriage is contracted, but this rule never became universal. In the third century (and probably earlier) newly married couples usually came to church to be blessed and to share in a nuptial eucharist; but the wedding itself remained wholly secular for another thousand years. Exceptionally at the wedding in 856 of the Saxon king Ethelwulf to Bertha, daughter of Charles the Bald, a priest blessed the ring but took no other part in the ceremony; the first recorded canon requiring a priest to officiate is found at Treves in 1227, but the requirement did not become general throughout Europe until after 1400.

II

What was true of marriage was correspondingly true of divorce; it was universally regarded as a private matter concerning only the parties involved, and nowhere was there anything corresponding to our divorce courts. Under Roman law either party could divorce the other at any time, with or without assigning reasons.¹ Under Greek law the husband had this privilege but the wife was obliged first to obtain the consent of a magistrate. Under Jewish law the right of the husband was unqualified but the wife could not exercise it under any circumstances; an owner can dispose at will of his property but property cannot dispose of its owner. The sole restriction laid on the husband was that he must give the divorced woman a "bill of divorcement," a certificate testifying that she was now released from his control.

This unrestricted right of the husband needs emphasis, for in modern discussions too much weight has been laid on the relevancy of Jewish Rabbinic disputes. It is true that R. Shammai taught that a man sinned if he divorced his wife unless she had been guilty of licentious behavior,² while R. Hillel told husbands that their consciences were clear if they merely preferred another wo-

¹ There was one special form of marriage, however, that admitted of no divorce; a form which for that reason was all but obsolete.

² Probably not to be limited to strict adultery.

man. But such rulings were purely academic; as long as a husband gave his wife the required certificate and restored her dowry, no one could interfere with his divorcing her.

In one regard the Jewish conception of women as property was shared by the contemporary lawcourts throughout the Roman Empire, in the definition of "adultery." In legal language this word described an offence against a man, never one against a woman; a husband could sue for damages if his wife was guilty of misconduct but she had no similar right if he misbehaved. But in the Graeco-Roman world the women were winning an increasing share in male privileges, so that in popular parlance "adultery" could be extended to cover a husband's misconduct as well as a wife's. Not, however, in Judaism where the term was defined by the Law (Leviticus 20.10): to the Jews the meaning of the word was thus divinely fixed forever. An unfaithful wife was an "adulteress," but a man became an "adulterer" only if his offence was committed with a married woman; the term could not be applied to him if his partner was unmarried.

Permanent legal "separation," as distinct from divorce, was unknown to both Romans and Jews. "Annulment," however, seems to have been understood. If a Jew should take a wife within the degrees specified in the Old Testament, according to the later Rabbinic ruling—and there is no reason to think this varied from the practice in New Testament times—it was null and void from the beginning and no bill of divorcement was issued when such a union was dissolved.

Two other rules in later Judaism may or may not have been in effect in New Testament times. If a marriage remained childless for a considerable period (eventually fixed at ten years) divorce was compulsory, since such a marriage was held obviously to lack God's blessing. And a procedure was invented to give women some relief from intolerable marriages, the authorities issuing what nowadays would be called a "mandamus" to the husband, ordering him to divorce his wife. But the act remained his, not the wife's.

III

The primary passage containing Christ's teaching on divorce is Mark 10.2-9, which records a discussion in strict rabbinic style. A question is propounded to the Rabbi, who by a counter-question asks the interrogators first to define their own position. This they do by citing Deuteronomy 24.1-4: Moses permits men to divorce their wives, provided the proper certificate is duly given. Christ replies that this concession by Moses is due to men's hard-heartedness; the same Moses stated the divine ideal in Genesis 2.24. Therefore, since it is the ideal, not the concession, that men ought to follow, the conclusion is clear: "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

To this public discussion Mark appends a "private" explanation given the disciples. Such explanations Gospel students have learned to view with some suspicion; in at least three cases in the Second Gospel (4.10 ff; 7.17 ff; 13.3 ff) they contain not the actual words of Christ but very early interpretations of the Church. And in the case of Mark 10.10-12 the interpretative character is unmistakable. The second clause, "If a woman shall put away her husband and marry another, she committeth adultery," states something impossible in Palestine; attempts to meet the difficulty by pointing to the case of Herodias are beside the mark, for she was universally regarded as an apostate whose actions were outside the Law. And in the first clause, "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her," "adultery" appears in a sense that no Jew would use or understand. In Luke 16.18, "Every one that putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and he that marrieth a woman that is put away from her husband committeth adultery," the first of these two difficulties is removed but the second remains. Both the Markan and the Lukan forms of this rule were framed under Gentile conditions, not under Jewish.

Abstractly, of course, it would be conceivable that it was Christ Himself who first used "adultery" in this new sense and so raised

woman to man's plane; it was He whose tenderness to women seemed revolutionary. But against this supposition the evidence of the First Gospel is decisive, for in Matthew 5.31-32 great pains are taken to avoid this foreign sense of the word. The passage reads: "It was said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorcement: but I say unto you, that every one who shall put away his wife . . . maketh her an adulteress: and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery." Here everything is strictly Jewish. There is no question of the first husband's adultery if he remarry, for no Jew would so describe his conduct. He is, however, responsible for his wife's sin; the passage taking for granted that she will either remarry or fall into a life of shame. And in either case the first husband is also responsible for the sin of her subsequent partner or partners.

But in one case the first husband cannot be said to make her an adulteress if he put her away, and that is if by her own act she has already made herself one while still married to him. Consequently the famous "exceptional clause" (omitted in the above quotation at the point indicated) is not a gloss but essential to completeness of statement; its presence in Matthew 5.32 gives the verse Rabbinic preciseness. This very preciseness, however, tells strongly against it as an authentic statement of Christ; He did not concern Himself with such meticulous detail. But telling still more strongly against it is its incompleteness, for—as must frequently have occurred—if the divorced wife neither remarried nor led an unchaste life, the first husband is free from all blame. He sins, only if his wife sins—and this Christ could never have meant to say. In other words, Matthew was familiar with the saying in its Markan form (certainly) and its Lukan form (possibly); they so impressed him that he endeavored to translate the thought into Jewish terms but succeeded very indifferently. If, however, Christ Himself had given "adultery" its Markan-Lukan definition, Matthew would not have had recourse to so roundabout a device but would have cited the Lord's words directly.

Matthew 19.9 remains for consideration. In the Authorized

Version this verse is almost identical with Luke 16.18 plus the "exceptional clause." But a glance at the Revised Version shows that this text is doubtful and that in "some ancient authorities" Matthew 19.9 reads exactly like Matthew 5.32. A further glance at a textual apparatus will reveal that these "ancient authorities" are very ancient and authoritative indeed; they include the most celebrated codex of all, the Vatican manuscript ("B"), whose text is rarely contaminated by the influence of parallel passages. Moreover, the transcribing of the Gospels was carried on almost wholly by non-Jews, who were far more likely to change a Jewish wording to a Greek than vice versa. It is most improbable that Matthew, who is painstakingly Jewish in 5.32, would let 19.9 slip by him in a non-Jewish form. And—most important of all—while in 5.32 the "exceptional clause" is demanded by the context, in the "received" text of 19.9 it has no organic connection with the passage; it is added like a gloss and has perplexed interpreters in all ages. In other words: The present form of Matthew 19.9—the verse most frequently cited in discussions of the divorce problem—is a textually corrupt Jewish-Christian revision of a Gentile-Christian interpretation of Christ's teaching.

IV

What Christ actually taught, then, was: A man and his wife "are no longer two, but one flesh; what, therefore, God has joined together, let not man put asunder." This and no more; the other verses cited above are very early Christian rules deduced from this primary saying. These rules take the primary saying as binding: Mark's and Luke's forms as binding without exception; Matthew's as admitting at least one exception. But there is one more New Testament passage to be considered.

As Christianity spread, a vexing problem made its appearance. Frequently one married partner was converted to the faith, while the other remained obdurate: what should then be done? To be sure the marriage was only a "natural" marriage—but it was of "natural," not of Christian marriages that Christ spoke. Even

in "natural" marriages couples had been joined together by God; dared man put them asunder? Saint Paul did not hesitate in the least: "If the unbeliever depart, let him depart: the brother or the sister is not under bondage in such cases" (I Corinthians 7.15). Why does Saint Paul presume so to contravene Christ's saying? Because he does not construe the saying in legal fashion but goes behind it to a higher principle: "God has called you in peace"; this peace of God, His precious gift to the soul, would be utterly destroyed in any attempt to preserve an impossible union. And that Saint Paul means that in such cases the believer has the right to remarry should never have been questioned; this is accepted not only by all modern commentators but even by the usually ultra-strict matrimonial discipline of the Roman Catholic Church (the "Pauline Prerogative").

Saint Paul here goes to the heart of the matter: Christ's sayings are not "laws" in the sense that they bind exactly as they are worded; that they possess authority because they have been enunciated by authority. It was Christ's manner simply to state a principle in its most extreme form, without indicating in any way how His statement is to be applied in special, concrete circumstances: "Swear not at all"; "If a man smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also"; "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee"; "When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, nor thy kinsmen"; "When thou prayest, enter into thy closet and shut thy door." All of these—and there are many others—are as unqualified as the saying on marriage, but everyone understands that in special circumstances all are to be interpreted by the higher rule of that love on which hang all the Law and the Prophets. If it be wrong to use this same principle in interpreting the saying on marriage, then Saint Paul went hopelessly wrong in granting his "prerogative."

Christ's meaning is plain. Marriage is God's creation and men and women are joined together in marriage to fulfil God's plan in creation; but it does not follow at all that every couple who have gone through the form of some marriage ceremony are so joined

together. To assert this would be to assert a manifest absurdity, out of all relation to reality as we see it. It was the Montanists who developed this theory and carried it through with logical rigidity, reaching the conclusion that since a man and his wife are one flesh, remarriage even after the death of a partner is impossible.

Who then is to decide in such cases? When Christ uttered the saying, He uttered it for the consciences of individuals; when He spoke, it was only to individuals that He *could* speak, for there was and could be no social legislation on the subject. Each man must decide in his own case; just as he must decide when to take an oath, not to turn the other cheek, to invite only his friends to a dinner, and in all the other complexities of life. To erect any of Christ's principles into a law that will take into account all the possible exceptions and yet do full justice to the moral rigor demanded is impossible.

V

It was only "natural" marriage that Christ considered, the marriage that was part of God's creation, and on Christian marriage He did not utter a single word; He spoke to the Jews, not to His disciples. Christian marriage is simply marriage between Christians and has a higher and more supernatural character because Christians have a higher and more supernatural character; its responsibilities are more intense because the responsibilities of Christians are more intense. Consequently the Church has always—and rightly—laid down rules to ensure that in this important regard the conduct of Christians is such as befits their calling. But the Church has never treated Christ's saying as so absolute that it admits of no exceptions.

In the Western Church the relaxation has come chiefly through a growingly intricate series of rules as to what constitutes a marriage; when these rules are not strictly observed at the beginning of the union, it may be dissolved no matter how long it may have endured, no matter how happy it may have been, no matter how many children may have been born of it. And these rules change

constantly; marriages that were perfectly valid ten years ago may be pronounced null and void if contracted under similar circumstances today. That many of these rules are wise and sensible is not the point; the point is that in enforcing them the Latin Church appeals beyond Christ's actual words to a higher principle. When, for instance, among Roman Catholics of the Eastern Rites (the so-called "Uniates") at the present time marriages are blessed as sacramental which would be utterly rejected among those of the Latin Rite, it is admitted frankly that a sage expediency and not inexorable law is the guide. In the Eastern Churches, including the great Orthodox Church, a theory of "moral death" has been evolved, which in practice leads to liberality in permitting remarriage after divorce—and for many reasons outside of adultery. The result is today that members of the Anglican Communion are finding that they can retain their full standing as Catholics and obtain release from evil marriages by transferring their allegiance to the Orthodox Communion.

To say, then, that the voice of Catholic tradition teaches that all remarriage after divorce is sinful is to say something that is glaringly untrue.

VI

The above discussion has tried to move solely in the realm of history. But a word or two on the practical problem as it now confronts us may not be amiss. To meet all proposals to relax strict rules with a sheer *non possumus* is out of the question; unless we can defend strictness by arguing from the higher law of love, our argument is sub-Christian. Yet perhaps the argument is possible. Undoubtedly we have no right to say that the problem can always be solved by the presence or absence of love in any given married couple. In the first place, "love," as taught by Christ, is not an emotion but an attitude of the will; emotions come and go past our control but a steady resolution of the will can carry married couples through countless difficulties. And in the second place, we must ask: "Love for *whom*?" Not simply that of a husband and wife for each other; a love that has van-

ished, perhaps. It is easy enough to say that they can love better if otherwise married; perhaps they can. But this is not the question. They are not the only married people in the world who are in trouble; countless couples learn how to transcend obstacles and win a higher and permanent affection for each other. If these were permitted to separate at the first quarrel, infinite harm would have been done them and our boasted "love" would have become a hellish thing. Even though Our Lord may have permitted exceptions from the principle as He gave it—and it is the contention of this essay that He actually permitted such exceptions—it may be best if His followers refuse to avail themselves of them. "All things are lawful, but not all are expedient"; probably in establishing a social "ethos" the force of example is more potent in marriage than in anything else; "if divorce causes my brother to stumble, I will forbear divorce forevermore."

Such rigidity may be undesirable—but it is arguable. But, as has been said, it is on the highest Christian principle, not on legalistic considerations, that the argument must be based.

Church Congress Syllabus No. 5
THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH AND REUNION
PART I

THE PROPOSED CONCORDAT:
A VENTURE IN UNITY

By CYRIL C. RICHARDSON

Associate Professor of Church History
Union Theological Seminary

The Proposed Concordat between the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. and the Protestant Episcopal Church is to be found in the Syllabus published jointly by the two churches and obtainable from the Church Missions House, 281 Fourth Avenue, New York City. It is also printed in the writer's book, *The Sacrament of Reunion*, Scribners 1940 (pp. 1-4), which deals with the whole issue more exhaustively than the present paper.

The terms of the Concordat, which is to be reported on at the forthcoming General Convention, are far from organic union. They are merely a first and very elementary step toward carrying out the joint declaration passed at the last Convention (1937) and at the General Assembly of 1938. There it was affirmed that "the two churches, one in the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Word of God, recognizing the Holy Scriptures as the supreme rule of faith, accepting the two Sacraments ordained by Christ, and believing that the visible unity of Christ's Church is the will of God, hereby solemnly declare their purpose to achieve organic union."

The Proposed Concordat is a practical and voluntary scheme whereby the clergy of either church will be enabled to minister to congregations of both. A unilateral form of "extension of ordination" is proposed. The Concordat has in view parishes where there are not a sufficient number of communicants to support two clergymen and it attempts to meet a further practical difficulty in giving the full recognition of both churches to chaplains who minister to members of both in the army and navy, in colleges, hospitals and similar institutions. The clergy entering into such an arrangement will be subject to the discipline of both denominations.

I. ANGLICANISM AND CHURCH UNITY

The purpose of this paper is to present the issue of the proposed Concordat in the light of history. Now history to be useful

should be accurate, but history to be instructive is always written from a definite point of view, for it involves interpretation. No historian can escape this dilemma, and it is only fair at the outset to state the point of view from which the problem is approached. The writer would claim that church unity is possible, desirable and urgent, and the historical examination of the issue of the Concordat presupposes this general thesis.

It is one of the tragedies of the Protestant Episcopal Church that the aims of church unity can no longer be taken for granted among all its members. We cannot delay here to argue the case for church unity; we can only affirm those contentions which have become commonplaces of ecumenical thinking: that the church should embody in her historic existence the unity which she claims as essential to her transcendent nature, and that on the mission field no less than at home there is an urgency in presenting a united Christian front against the vigorous assailants of the Christian religion. Let us never forget that we live in a Christendom of unhappy and at times acrimonious divisions. To the casual observer of Christianity it must seem naive and presumptuous to hear from so many pulpits that Christianity alone can unite the world and prevent those catastrophes of history of which we are so keenly aware in these days of war. If the Church itself cannot live in unity and peace, what possible chance is there that organized Christianity can unite the world?

The problem of church unity is as old as Christianity itself (Mark 9: 38ff; I Cor. 1: 10ff), and the historian is beset with the fact that organized Christianity has been a divisive rather than a unifying influence in many periods of its history. The unique position that Anglicanism holds by virtue of its historic origins, blending Catholic and Protestant forms in a liturgical and national church, serves well to illustrate this tragic fact. We have, it is true, initiated fewer schisms than most Christian communions: yet we have presented the Ecumenical Movement with one of its most difficult problems. We have urged, talked and presented the case for church unity with more thought and anxiety than most churches; but we have been conspicuously absent from the great

church unions of the modern day. We have refused to enter fully even into such ventures as the Federal Council. It is therefore not surprising that other churches should suspect us of a certain lack of good faith when we profess our anxiety over the wounds in the Body of Christ. Again and again we have demonstrated our impotence in the practical realm of church unity. The reason for this is not hard to find. Ever since the 16th century we have had a large body of high and low churchmen who are vigorous enough to wreck any proposed scheme. The storm of Protestant protest that greeted the Malines Conversations has its parallel in the *odium theologicum* which appears in many of the letters in *The Living Church*, dealing with the Concordat. As a church we have not successfully bridged the gap between Catholicism and Protestantism in a way which offers a solution of the issue for the Ecumenical Movement. We are not united theologically, or even liturgically, though our liturgy is doubtless a unifying element in our tradition. We are united partly by accident as a national church in our English origins and partly by a common economic and social level. But perhaps most of all our unity is due to a sense that The Church is superior to theological and even liturgical differences.

Now at first sight this might seem to be the most fruitful of all approaches to church unity. To instill a feeling for The Church above all the diversities of theological speculation and liturgical preference appeals as a most practicable way to achieve organic unity. Yet it is precisely this sense of The Church that presents the greatest stumbling block in the way of unity, for it is inseparable in so many Anglican minds from Episcopacy, Apostolic Succession, the Real Presence, and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. When we examine anyone of these features carefully we come back to the old Anglican problem of diversity in theology. There are Catholic and Protestant interpretations of each of these doctrines and the champions of both have often played fast and loose with the historic standards of Anglicanism. Scholars as learned as Gore and Streeter in the modern day have read early church history from one or other of these points of view. Because our

evidences are so scanty, and guesses, which cannot fail to be partly based on these presuppositions, have to play such a large role in reconstructing the history, they have arrived at directly opposing results. The exact interpretation of our standards presents the same problem, and it is further complicated by the fact that their framers consciously sought for forms of words which would avoid offending either party and thus include both traditions in one national church which would prove to be a workable institution. Hence we face the most tragic dilemma of Anglicanism and reunion, namely, that the fundamental basis of Anglican unity is itself the insuperable barrier to the unity of Christendom.

That, in brief, is the essential problem. The sense of The Church which most of us share, be we Catholic or Protestant in our sympathies, is something in which we are nurtured. But directly we try to give it formal definition and lay down the bases upon which church unity with other communions is possible, our theological differences express themselves and provide the occasion for those endless debates on Orders and Polity with which the history of Anglicanism is littered.

By and large, Anglicans have tried to solve this problem in one of two ways. Either it is urged that our church is committed to the Catholic tradition of episcopacy and must demand the reordination of all those in non-Episcopal orders; or else it is claimed that we are a Protestant and Reformed church which has historically viewed such orders as valid, and hence we should accept Presbyterian and other ministers as our equals and unite with them at once. Both schemes are manifestly impracticable: Protestant clergy (and above all Presbyterian) are no more likely to submit to reordination than our General Convention is likely to forego completely the claims of episcopacy. Thus our church is fundamentally torn, some urging reunion with Eastern Orthodoxy and with Rome on Catholic principles, others demanding an explicit entrance into a Pan-Protestant movement. Since neither party represents a majority, we find ourselves in the famous *via media*, which is just another term for being able to do nothing about it. In 1934, for instance, the negotiations between the

Church of England and the Church of Scotland were abruptly terminated because the Anglicans refused to accede to the Presbyterian demand that they should explicitly affirm the validity of their orders.

Yet we stand at a very critical moment in the history of Christianity in America. We have been a significant church in the past because Protestantism has been divided, but that this will long remain so is gravely open to doubt. The recent Methodist union promises to be the center of a greater Protestant union. Even now they number eight million, and should other churches join with them, they will begin to vie with Rome's sixteen million. Two million Anglicans will then hardly be important in America's religious life, and we shall have lost the chance of influencing the course of church unity which we so ardently profess. If we retract a proposal as small as the Concordat, we may as well face the fact that our future overtures will be taken *cum grano salis*, and other churches will devote themselves to the issue of church unity with those communions that do not offer and withdraw the right hand of fellowship with the facility of Anglicans.

The opportunity has now been opened up for us effectively to graft something of the richness of our heritage into the Protestant movement. Presbyterians can gain much from us: we on our part stand to profit greatly from them. Now is the moment when we can seriously initiate steps to bring the fullness of both traditions into the unity of the One Body, mutually enriching our Christian life and opening countless doors for future service on the mission field no less than at home. We do not propose to unite with Presbyterians on the basis of a lowest common denominator. Rather is it our aim to break down the "wall of partition," so that the riches of both heritages may be combined. Our eyes are set on the future as well as on the past. In Europe Christianity is itself endangered by the rise of a new paganism, and the difficulties of church unity in that part of the world are made acute by the potency of past traditions. In America our religious heritage is freer and not so bound by the past seeds of *odium theologicum*. Across the Atlantic they look to us to take

the initiative and to provide those precedents which will prove fruitful in overcoming our dilemma. The proposed Concordat has made us conscious of this responsibility and alive to our opportunities. It has awakened us, moreover, to the varied richness of the church in her different manifestations through history. It has provided a step to that fulfillment of the church's unity for which we have so long prayed and hoped. That is why it is now so crucial a matter.

II. ANGLICANISM AND PRESBYTERIANISM

If it is from this point of view that we seek union with Presbyterians, it is important to ask whether the great values of the two traditions are mutually exclusive. Were this the case, a scheme of union, even if it were adopted, would be little more than formal and would have the sorry effect of accentuating the basic distinctions. It would issue in nothing else but endless controversy.

Anglicanism and Presbyterianism¹ differ essentially in two main areas, those of liturgy and church government. The ethos of the two traditions has been largely determined by these differences. Briefly put, they come down to this: Presbyterianism has emphasized the Word rather than the Sacrament; the presbyter and layman rather than the bishop. From these basic variations there derive the marked features of both communions. The place of the Bible is central in Presbyterianism and the sermon plays an important though not always a predominant part in the Sunday morning service. Through the sermon Christ is held up to the people and the gospel is expounded and applied to the varying needs and circumstances of each generation of Christians. The Lord's Supper itself is an aspect of this same gospel. The Sacrament is not so much the bread and wine as the whole relation

¹ To understand the genius of Presbyterianism one must of course read its standards (*Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.*). Two very helpful recent books may also be noted: James Moffatt's *The Presbyterian Churches* (1928), unfortunately out of print; and P. Carnegie Simpson's *The Fact of the Christian Church* (1935).

of the devout communicant to the living Christ who is ever present with His faithful people. Through the elements, the outward signs of Christ's pledge and seal, the Christian feeds on Christ by faith. The Word of God, His declaration of forgiveness in Christ and His promise of the Spirit, is made real in the sermon and the sacrament alike. It is what God does that is more important than what man does. Hence Presbyterianism eschews any idea that the priest possesses a mysterious power to sacrifice Christ anew or to offer Him again for the sins of the world. The sacrifice of the eucharist for Presbyterians is essentially the appropriation of the benefits of Christ's sacrifice on Calvary. In response we offer the sacrifice of our prayers and thanksgiving and present ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice to God. In private as well as in public devotional life the Bible is the fountain-head of Presbyterian piety. It is in biblical rather than in sacramental terms that the Presbyterian describes the deepest reaches of his communion with God.

In the realm of church government the Bible is again the criterion. Presbyterian polity is patterned after the New Testament precedent. Presbyter and bishop were synonymous in primitive Christianity. Thus, thoroughly in accord with the earliest Christian history, Presbyterians believe that the church should be ruled by a body of elders, such as we know Paul appointed on his missionary journeys. We shall examine later the historic problem of the rise of the mon-episcopate; here it is only necessary to state that the primitive presbyterian mode of government was taken from Judaism with its Sanhedrins (in the Diaspora these were called *gerousiai*), and continued unchanged in many localities (e.g. Rome, Corinth, Philippi, Alexandria) long after the decease of the apostles. Hence it is axiomatic in Presbyterianism that there is no higher order of the ministry above a presbyter (= bishop). Superintendents, moderators, and other officers may be appointed to exercise a larger supervision over the local churches, but they are only presbyters enjoying temporarily a wider jurisdiction. They are not a clerical order and they possess no greater authority

than other presbyters to preach the Word, to administer the sacraments and, with their fellow presbyters, to ordain.

One other feature in the Presbyterian view of church government must be noted, though it is not so clearly derived from holy scripture. It is the role that democracy and lay leadership play in its polity. Both are certainly compatible with the New Testament forms and are supported in the Westminster Confession by texts from scripture; but historically they are more connected with the political theory of the sixteenth century. We cannot, however, elaborate on them here. It must suffice to mention that the democratic traditions in our political life are directly to be traced to the Puritan influence on American culture, and it is noteworthy how the government of our church, as distinct from the Church of England, has so largely adopted this pattern. Our tradition has been greatly enriched by those principles of freedom of religion and democracy which the church in Scotland so courageously and effectively championed. Their opposition to prelacy was particularly directed against the Stuart claim that the king, rather than the church, should have the unconditional right of appointment. The issue of presbytery or episcopacy was thus complicated by a political factor in the Scottish resistance against Stuart absolutism. In America, Presbyterians and Anglicans alike enjoy freedom of church government, untrammelled by the interference of the state. Similarly, our episcopate is democratically elected by the church: unlike the bishops of the Church of England, ours are not appointees of king or Parliament. In stating our principles of agreement with Presbyterianism, it is important to bear these factors in mind.

The place of the laity in Presbyterian polity is well illustrated by their ruling elders. They are ordained laity under permanent vows, who are responsible for the government and spiritual discipline of the congregation, and together with the pastor they form the Church Session. In this matter of lay leadership our own church has not been uninfluenced by the Puritan heritage. While we have no ordained laity specifically responsible for the religious tone of our congregations, our laymen do play a sig-

nificant part in General Convention and have far wider powers in the government of the church than the lay representatives in the English National Assembly.

This democratic element has also influenced Presbyterian liturgy in so far as it is not bound by a uniform prayer book. The *Book of Common Worship* is only voluntary and the individual minister is allowed freedom in preparing his prayers and services. On the whole, however, Reformed liturgy is characterized by a fairly uniform structure: it is the content of the prayers rather than the rationale of the service which varies.

Are these Presbyterian fundamentals antithetical to Anglicanism? Do they endanger our tradition? The answers to these questions, which are the basic ones for the Concordat, depend on our understanding of Anglicanism, and we are at once faced with the perennial problem of our church: are we Catholics or Protestants? Which are our standards? Such a good case can be made out on both sides, despite the title of our church, that it would be foolish to essay a complete answer in a paragraph. The Prayer Book refers to the clergy as priests rather than as presbyters, and this is indicative of the essential ambiguity of our tradition. In the sixteenth century Whitgift defended the title on the ground that the word "priest" is etymologically related to "presbyter," which is certainly correct. Pages have been written on the opposite side (especially since the Tractarian Movement) to show that it means *sacerdos* in the Roman sense.

Here we have in essence the problem of Anglicanism: we use traditional words and phrases that are open to a double interpretation. We are both Catholic and Protestant, yet it is clear from our standards that we are neither Papists nor Puritans. Our Articles of Religion embody many of the teachings that the great Reformers championed: e.g. the supremacy of the Bible, Justification by Faith, the two sacraments, the marriage of priests, the denial of transubstantiation, etc. On the other hand, we have guarded the historic episcopate, the mass is central in our liturgical life, and we speak (albeit at times glibly) about the sacrifice of the eucharist.

There can be no gainsaying that we are both Catholic and Protestant in our tradition, and the major error among some of our theologians has generally arisen from trying to prove, with more learning than insight, that we are either one or the other, instead of both. Even more fruitless from the point of view of the historian has been the attempt in modern days to prove that Anglicanism is a Western form of Eastern Orthodoxy and that we are committed to the Greek views of the holy tradition and the seven sacraments. Our historical affinity with Greek Christianity as a national and at times an erastian church with the historic episcopacy, together with an ardent desire to show Rome that *Apostolicae Curae* was more presumptuous than accurate, has often led to the claim that Anglicanism is the "third branch of the Catholic Church." Its irony lies in the fact that the other two branches persistently refuse to recognize one another, much less our church, as rightfully Catholic.

This thesis cannot be fully developed here. One thing, however, must be stressed. Much of our difficulty lies in the ambiguous use of words rather than in the conflict of clearly formulated ideas. Some Anglicans fear that we shall compromise the priesthood by admitting the validity of Presbyterian orders; others say that Presbyterianism and Anglicanism are antithetical because the former denies the sacrifice of the mass. Most frequently such people fail to state clearly what they mean by such terms, much less how they would defend their particular views by any accurate reference to our own standards.

There is no avoiding the fact that our tradition is ambiguous: our formularies, our liturgy, and our whole history betray it. Only special pleading and an unwarranted use of isolated phrases from the *Book of Common Prayer* can tie us completely to either the Protestant or the Catholic form of Christianity. The pertinent question for our discussion is not how we can best defend either position as Anglican, to the exclusion of the other. Rather, must we ask: Are there any Catholic elements in our position which are directly antithetical to Presbyterian teaching? The breadth of our religious life is certainly enhanced by having rep-

representatives of both the Protestant and the Catholic extremes in our church. But we are essentially a prayer-book church, and any scheme of union must do justice to both Catholic and Protestant strains in our heritage. It must at all costs avoid overstating the case for either, and must not threaten the exclusion of either.

The Catholic elements in Anglicanism fall into two categories: those which Presbyterianism has retained, and those which for one reason or another have been neglected in the Puritan tradition. Of the former the most important are the canon of scripture and the Christological decisions of the General Councils. The Reformers abandoned neither, and the Presbyterian standards have carefully guarded the definitions of the great creeds of Christendom. On the other hand, Presbyterianism has broken with the episcopate, and especially in this country has tended to neglect the centrality of the Lord's Supper. These features, however, are complementary to Presbyterianism, not antithetical. We cannot do violence to the New Testament forms of church government: we have noted the correctness of the Presbyterian interpretation of their history and we shall have something more to say on this issue later. But the significance of the episcopate in the Catholic tradition commends it to the united church. There is no reason why it could not be preserved in such a union. Indeed, a form of constitutional episcopal government which at the same time guarded those elements of democracy and of lay leadership which Presbyterianism has so greatly contributed to the heritage of Christendom, is both conceivable and eminently practicable. It is, however, important to realize that we cannot press the claims for episcopacy beyond their legitimate limits. We must frankly acknowledge that a direct succession of ordinations from the hands of the apostles cannot be convincingly proven from the records which we possess.

We shall return in a future section to the issue of the Lord's Supper. It is only important to point out here that the Presbyterian and Anglican traditions in worship are not mutually exclusive. In the early church the liturgy comprised *both* the Word and the sacrament, which roughly corresponded to the two parts

of the service called the Liturgy of the Catechumens² and the Liturgy of the Faithful. In Presbyterianism it is the former, in Anglicanism the latter, which has received the greater emphasis. But both should form a complete whole. The Word, that is the sermon and the reading of scripture, leads up to the central action of the eucharist. Either part by itself detracts from the fulness of Christian liturgy. Anglicanism can enrich its worship with better preaching and a more competent use of scripture than our epistles and gospels provide. Presbyterianism can deepen its spiritual life by laying more stress upon sacramental action. God is certainly present to the faithful not only when Holy Communion is celebrated, but also when the Word is read and preached. But that does not mean that He is present in precisely the same way. There is an essential difference between a sacrament and a psalm. To the former Christ has attached His seal and pledge and in sacramental action we are able to transcend the limitations of words. In such actions, which have behind them not only the long and powerful tradition of the church's life but also the very promises of our Lord Himself, we meet God face to face and realize and appropriate more fully than in any other way the abounding riches of the grace of God in Jesus Christ.

Finally, the liberty enjoyed by Presbyterians in the composition of prayers may well help us to avoid that formalism which ever besets a fixed liturgy. On the other hand, the dignity and decorum of our Prayer Book, which has already exercised a significant influence on the Free Churches, will continue to enrich the Puritan tradition. The closer relations of our two churches, which the Concordat envisages, can thus add to the fulness of both traditions. It will enable us to preserve the values and to repair the deficiencies in our different heritages.

III. ANGLICAN APPROACHES TO OTHER CHURCHES

The Concordat is a new effort to solve the perennial problem that Anglicanism faces. It is for this reason that it deserves

² It may be noted that the Reformed Rites can be directly traced to the mass, and the usual Sunday morning service in the Reformed churches really corresponds to the Liturgy of the Catechumens, or ante-communion, and not to Prone or to the daily offices (i.e., morning prayer).

careful consideration. To appreciate its full significance it is necessary first to say something of the formal conversations that the Anglican Communion has carried on with other churches. Of these, the most fruitful have been with those bodies which have preserved an episcopate claiming to be continuous with the primitive church. Inter-communion has been established with the Church of Sweden (1922), whose ecclesiastical traditions are very much akin to our own; and with the Old Catholics (1931). While our relations with Eastern Orthodoxy are still pending, there is a fair chance that they will issue in a similar arrangement. The Rumanian Church has already acknowledged the validity of our orders, although the other Eastern churches have reserved their judgment until the meeting of the Pro-Synod. There are, of course, great differences between the standards of Anglicanism and the teachings of Eastern Orthodoxy,³ and many Anglicans feel that the case for Catholic tradition in our church has been somewhat overstated in our conversations with our Eastern brethren, most notably at Bucharest. None the less it may not be impossible to come to terms with Eastern Orthodoxy, though the geographic remoteness of this branch of Christendom does not make organic unity a very urgent problem. With Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, and Baptists, however, union is a far more pressing issue in Great Britain and America.

More radical than these conversations are the relations that Anglicanism has had with the Reformed Church of Hungary (1921) and the Mission Churches in South India. In the former case, scattered Hungarian congregations in America were brought under the episcopal jurisdiction of our church by an "additional" ordination of their clergy at the hands of our bishops. It was, however, explicitly stated that they accepted this episcopal laying on of hands "without repudiating their existing orders." Such

³ The chief difficulties concern the Greek doctrine of the holy tradition and the refusal of Eastern Orthodoxy to admit of the possibility of internal schism. They hold that they alone represent the Catholic and Apostolic church and that outside the bounds of those churches in communion with Constantinople there can be neither church nor sacrament.

a solution of the problem is in line with our present Canon 11, §6, and, as we shall see, it underlies the proposals of the Concordat. The Hungarian agreement, it is true, did not attempt to state the question of orders with theological clarity. The conception of an "additional" ordination, however, represents a real advance upon the subject of ordination *sub conditione*. This has been frequently put forward by Anglicans, and most notably in the conference of the Church of England with the Free Churches in 1925. None the less, conditional ordination is little more than an unsatisfactory attempt to avoid the whole issue.

In the South India scheme, and in the proposals put forward by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Dr. Garvie for the organic union of Anglicanism with Non-conformity in England, a different solution of the problem has been offered. There it is proposed to guard the historic episcopate in the United Church, though to temper it with those principles of representative government by councils which are so characteristic of Calvinism. The issue at once arises whether or not to accept as valid the orders of all the participating communions. In both schemes it is planned to do this, though all future ordinations will be by bishops and assistant presbyters. The grounds on which this position can be defended are various. It is an obvious and practical solution of a vexed problem; and certainly to demand re-ordination or even conditional ordination of those in non-episcopal orders would be to delay church unity until the millennium. But whether or not it explicitly implies the validity of non-episcopal orders is open to question. As a temporary arrangement, it might be defended by the Greek doctrine of economy, whereby the church as Mistress of all Grace has the right to relax her discipline in cases of emergency and to validate formerly invalid sacraments without further ceremony. In any case, the proposed United Church in South India does not become an integral part of the Anglican communion, and hence the Anglican attitude to Holy Orders is not vitally involved. Moreover, it must always be borne in mind that the predominant influence in our missionary churches in that

area has been evangelical, and it may well be open to question whether the scheme would be possible if a larger body of Catholic opposition had to be overcome.

IV. THE PROBLEM OF NON-EPISCOPAL ORDERS

Anglicanism has never formally expressed itself on the validity of non-episcopal orders. Its custom since the sixteenth century has been to require the episcopal ordination of clergy in such orders, without stating with any explicit clarity the precise meaning of the act. Like most features of Anglicanism it is open to a two-fold interpretation. The apparent meaning of our Canon II, §6, together with the weighty opinions of such early theologians as Hooker, Overall, Cosin, Bramhall, Bancroft, and even Laud, lends support to the thesis that such an ordination is a regularizing through the historic episcopate of orders regarded as valid. To use Elizabethan terms, one would say that the former orders were "effectual," since they were given in communions that shared in the *esse* of the church. Lacking the episcopate, however, these communions were deprived of the "perfection of the church." Their presbyters were ordained *in casu necessitatis*, and when their clergy wished to be presented to English benefices, these orders had to be perfected or regularized in order to conform to the civil and ecclesiastical laws of the realm. On the other hand, it has been urged that since such clergy had to submit to the whole Ordinal for priests, they were viewed merely as laymen. It is difficult to maintain this position in the light of two facts. The early Anglican church in her standards very carefully refrained from "unchurching" her sister bodies of the Reformation on the Continent, and not a few early bishops had their misgivings about re-ordaining Reformed clergy. Overall, whose views on the episcopate were by no means evangelical, actually admitted Dr. De Laune to a benefice without episcopal ordination, and in the famous case of Whittingham, Archbishop Sandys tried to make it very clear that the "church (of Geneva) is not touched." It is an obvious fact of history that the early

Anglicans felt themselves far more in sympathy with the Reformed churches on the Continent than with Rome, and Cosin's renowned letter is symptomatic of a wide consensus of opinion on the question. He urged his correspondent, a Mr. Cordel, to communicate with the French Protestants, claiming that there was no "total nullity" of Reformed orders. Though their clergy were "not so duly and rightly ordained" as the bishops of the Church of England, yet it was wrong to infer they were "therefore not priests or ministers of the church at all."

The other factor that must be borne in mind is our Canon 11, §6. The Preface that the bishop is permitted to read in the beginning of the service speaks of a clergyman in non-episcopal orders as "already ordained a minister of Christ," and in the Letters of Ordination a formal "recognition" is granted to his former ministry, and it is claimed that there has been "added" to this "commission" "the grace and authority of Holy Orders as required for the exercise of the ministry of this church." The language of the Canon is, of course, very guarded. It does not say explicitly whether the orders are valid or not. But it does recognize some kind of former ordination and views the clergyman as a "minister of Christ" distinct from a layman. Moreover, by implication it recognizes that non-episcopal communions share in the *esse* of the church, since without this there could be neither "ordination" nor "minister of Christ."

The Concordat tries to solve this problem of orders by making explicit what seems to lie behind this Canon and the attitude of the early Anglican theologians. It disavows any "reordination" and demands from Presbyterians the episcopal laying on of hands in order to satisfy the claims of episcopacy in the Anglican tradition. Appropriately, it suggests an ordination sentence which in a revised form is taken from our own Ordinal (page 542, the alternative sentence; for the term "presbyter," cf. the Scottish Communion Office), and calls the ceremony "extending ordination." By this the validity of former orders is granted and their deficiencies recognized. For a Presbyterian to minister to an Anglican congregation his orders only need to be extended and

their deficiency rectified. Under such a scheme the claims of our Canon Law would be adequately guarded and the historic episcopate preserved, while the essential validity of Presbyterian orders would not be impugned.

There can be little doubt that some such measure is practicable. To re-ordain Presbyterians is out of the question. To demand this is to put an insuperable barrier in the way of Christian unity, and a barrier moreover which cannot be cogently defended from our standards. On the other hand, the Concordat does guard the form of the episcopate, and here it is truly in line with Catholic feeling for the continuity of the church. Certainly Anglicanism could never enter with an easy conscience into a reunion scheme which abandoned the historic episcopate. Nor would the arrangement of immediately granting the validity and regularity of non-episcopal orders be altogether satisfactory. The proposals of the Concordat seem to offer a fruitful solution to a vexed problem, and one in harmony with the general Anglican tradition. Moreover, they open up a whole realm of ecumenical possibilities to which we must now turn.

The Concordat's proposals are unilateral. "Extending ordination" is not only to be granted to Presbyterians, but also to Anglicans. Since Presbyterians have never claimed in recent days⁴ that any deficiency attaches to our orders, this may seem somewhat strange. It is, of course, partly to be explained on the ground that a unilateral agreement is symbolic of the fact that the two churches regard each other as equals. But something far more significant underlies the proposal. It raises a basic question of ecumenical theology: Has not the division of Christendom actually impaired the sufficiency of orders in every Christian communion? The terms "validity" and "regularity" really belong in a structure of Christian thought in which there is only one historic church, but within which, for one reason or another,

⁴ There is some evidence that in the seventeenth century Presbyterians, at least in France, sometimes re-ordained those in episcopal orders. Behind this practice lies the Puritan contention that episcopacy was "a human and pernicious invention," while the Presbyterian polity alone was divine, since it was modelled after the scriptural pattern.

irregular practices from time to time occur. We do not, however, live in such a Christendom. The historic reality of the churches, rather than the church, is our heritage. Hence it comes about that while we devoutly believe our clergy are true priests of God in our own communion, the sufficiency of their orders is limited by the bounds of the different denominations. Those who ordain them do not represent the whole historic church, they represent only a fragmentary part of it. There is a real spiritual absence, as well as a physical absence, of Romanists and Presbyterians in our ordinations. While we believe our church shares in the reality of the Transcendent Church, none the less it is but a small section of the historic church militant. It shares in the sin of schism, which so vitally hinders its effectiveness on the world.

It is to repair this defect that the rite of "extending ordination" is proposed. A new sacrament is being born in the church, the sacrament of reunion, through which the grace of God may operate to heal the wounds of the Body of Christ. Through this sacrament our mutual deficiencies can be redeemed, and the fuller life of a united church made evident to all men by means of a more widely recognized ministry. Here, in repentance and gladness, we can begin to repair the divisive influences of the Reformation and at the same time preserve its gains. Thus the "extending ordination" performed by Presbyterians on Anglicans is no empty form to satisfy the practical claims of a unilateral agreement. Rather is it a religious rite of momentous significance. It signalizes in some measure the restoration of the unity of the church, the repairing of those deficiencies that attach to the orders of all churches, and above all, the ingrafting of the richness of both traditions into the fulness of the one body. It is for this reason that "extending ordination" promises to be a really significant development in ecumenical thinking about the church.

V. THE EPISCOPATE

It has been necessary to deal at length with the problem of orders because this has been of crucial importance in our nego-

tiations for church unity. It is often claimed that we are too "orders-conscious" and that in our conversations with other churches we should devote more attention to other great doctrines of the faith. It is, however, no accident that this issue has been pressed to the fore. It is central just because the unity of Anglicanism is grounded in a sense of The Church, which is inseparable from the Christian tradition. The episcopate is the outward form through which our continuous life with the apostolic church is traditionally symbolized and in some measure actually realized. There can be no gainsaying that we are committed to this conception both by our Ordinal (page 529) and by our Office of Institution (page 561, "Ministers of Apostolic Succession"). It has, furthermore, played a vital role in Anglican theology. The problem of church unity is for us very largely the problem of church orders, precisely because we do not wish to inflict any particular theology on the whole church, or to demand any other profession of faith outside the scriptures and the creeds,⁵ which are almost universally accepted throughout Christendom and are certainly the dogmatic foundations of Presbyterianism. A united church cannot be any less comprehensive in theology than the Anglican communion, and since in this there are many variations of theology, it would be foolish to press any one interpretation of the Trinity, for instance, as the only true one. But a united church, to have meaning, must at all costs be a church, and the sense of churchliness underlies its very existence. It is not to be a debating club, or a society for ethical culture, or even a theological university. When one examines the meaning of the church, one is at once confronted with such problems as orders, episcopacy, sacraments, and liturgy, for it is largely through these forms that our awareness of The Church is realized. We do not here intend to detract from the preaching of the Word or Christian fellowship, as if they were not essential to the church's life, but we lay our emphasis upon the other factors, partly because their symbolic character is able to transcend the personal and variable element in preaching, and even more because they are the

⁵ As in the Chicago (1886) and Lambeth (1888 and 1920) quadrilaterals.

disputed ones in negotiations for church unity. No one disputes that the preaching of the Word and the fellowship of love are necessary conditions for existence of the church, but there are many who deny that the episcopate is such a condition.

Whatever one may think historically about the development of church government, the episcopal succession is graced with a longer tradition than any other form and is more widely accepted as a symbol of the church's continuous life. There can be little doubt that the Presbyterian polity is far nearer the New Testament model than our own. But this does not necessarily commend it to an ecumenical church. One has to take into account the power of tradition in moulding those sacramental forms through which the sense of the church is made real. That is why the episcopal polity, with its claims to succession, seems a most appropriate form of government for a united church. In practice it is not widely different from Knox's Superintendents, the Moderators in Presbyterianism, or the Bishops of the Reformed Church in Hungary. But in the religious life of the great majority of modern Christendom it is very different: through it the sacramental system and the church's continuity are guarded. However it arose, it is certainly a sacramental form of great significance, and no scheme for church unity which proposed to abandon it would have the remotest chance of success.

Yet on the other hand it is imperative to realize that modern historical scholarship has undermined the claim that it is the New Testament model. It became a universal feature of the church's life around the middle of the second century. There is no adequate scriptural basis for denying that Presbyterians constitute a church. Scripturally they are nearer the New Testament than we are. If we claim, moreover, that the episcopal development arose under the guidance of God's providence, certainly those who have read sixteenth century history have good reason to believe that God's Spirit was not absent from the growth of the Reformed Churches. There is little doubt that they preserved more of the gospel than Rome embodied at the time. The working of God's spirit did not cease in the second century, nor is the Spirit bound

by the chain of apostolic succession through the episcopate. Because the Reformed Churches lacked the episcopate, there is no reason to deny that they had valid orders or sacraments. Seeing, moreover, that many of the historic claims for episcopacy in the primitive church have become tenuous, to say the least, in the light of modern scholarship, it is as dangerous as it is disastrous to press the claims for episcopacy beyond their legitimate limits. As the appropriate form of polity for a united church it has everything in its favor, because of its powerful and continuous tradition; but as an article of faith by which all those communions lacking it can be read out of the church, it becomes an insuperable barrier to Christian unity and a creation of the mind of ecclesiastics rather than of the mind of Christ.

VI. THE ORIGINS OF EPISCOPACY

It is not possible in these pages to make an adequate examination of the historical origins of the episcopate. I have attempted to discuss the problem more fully in my book, *The Sacrament of Reunion* (chs. 2-3), and to outline the facts of which we can be relatively certain from our documents. On the whole, they are surprisingly scanty and they must always be carefully distinguished from the *guesses* which we make when we try to form a fuller picture of the ecclesiastical development of the early church. All sorts of presuppositions enter into these guesses, and more often they are assumed rather than explicitly stated. Sometimes the historian himself is unaware of the bias which leads him to adopt a certain line of argument and his weight of learning frequently deceives the unsuspecting reader. The reason why Gore and Streeter could write such flatly contradictory books on the origins of church government is not that the one was more cognizant of the facts than the other, or that either *qua* historian was lacking in learning or good faith. Instead, the fact is to be explained by the scantiness of our sources and by the failure of both writers to make the reader fully aware of the premises from which they made their guesses in reconstructing the history of

which we really know so little. There are many wild guesses in Streeter's *Primitive Church*, but for the most part they are not determined by a theological bias, and the reader will get a truer picture of the early development for this very reason. Gore's *The Church and the Ministry* is much more clearly an apologetic piece of writing. Because he believed in the episcopate so firmly as an essential mark of the true church in all ages, he read his views back into the mind of primitive Christianity with far too little caution. Where evidence failed him he filled the *lacunae* with guesses which were in line with his theological opinions. He argues his case with such cogency that the reader is often at a loss to see exactly where the error lies. One example of this may suffice. He admits that the ministerial equipment of the primitive church extended far beyond the twelve disciples. He imagines that a not insignificant number had received a direct command from Christ, and as such were recognized as duly appointed clergy. He then continues (page 234), "There were other fellow laborers with the apostles who certainly did not belong to the original equipment of the church. These we should certainly suppose would have received ordination from those who did." This sounds a rather convincing hypothesis, but there is not a shred of evidence to support it. It tells us much more about the way in which Gore would have organized the primitive church than the way in which it probably was organized. We have always to use this word "probably," but it is essential to know how we arrive at these probabilities. Our knowledge of Jewish institutions and the general outlook of the primitive church are far more weighty grounds for these guesses than our own doctrinal opinions. Some theological bias will always enter into the writing of early church history, for no man can completely escape the structure of his own mind. Yet the true historian should make a desperate attempt to overcome these limitations. He must have a sympathetic imagination which is able to do justice to the diversity of early Christian thought and to its essential differences from our own. Hence those who feel most strongly about episcopacy as the divine model for church government are the most unsuited

to write about its origins. They are far more likely to go astray than those to whom it is a matter of little consequence what the primitive church believed on the question.

Among scholars of the modern day there is a fairly unanimous consensus of opinion about the origins of the episcopate. The only historians of repute who still reject these widely attested results of scholarship belong to that theological party which has a definite case to plead. It will be our purpose to outline the generally accepted position. A detailed defense of it is beyond the scope of this paper.

Our knowledge of the polity of the primitive church is limited for the most part to the Pauline communities, which seem to have been organized according to the pattern of Jewish Sanhedrins (*gerousiai* in the Diaspora). A number of elders (*presbyteroi* or *episcopoi*; *archontes* was the Jewish term in the Diaspora) were appointed for the office of teaching and ruling the congregation. Whether or not they were ordained we do not know. Ordination of elders in Judaism seems to have been confined to Palestine, and we have no means of ascertaining how early the Christians broke with the precedent. It is probable, moreover, that the earliest *presbyteroi* did not necessarily play the leading role in worship. In Judaism it was a function of the laity and in the most primitive Christianity it may well be that anyone recognized as having a gift (*charisma*) for "saying thanks well" (i.e. "making eucharist") could preside at the Lord's Supper (I Cor. 14: 17). By the turn of the century, however, it had become the normal right of the presbyters (I Clement, Didache). Like the Jewish elders, the Christian presbyters were regarded as the direct successors of those chosen by Moses (Numbers 11: 16ff) —a tradition incorporated in the earliest Christian ordination prayers (Hippolytus, Serapion). While the Apostles (a wide term which could include Paul, Barnabas, James the Lord's brother, and probably anyone who had witnessed the Resurrection) held a unique position of authority over the local churches which they founded and visited on their journeys, the bodies of elders were regarded as capable of transmitting their authority

to successors (so I Clement). Finally, the place of prophets in early Christianity must always be borne in mind. They appointed and laid their hands on Paul and Barnabas for their missionary journey (Acts 13: 1-4), an act that Paul certainly did not regard as validating his apostleship. The charismatic outlook of the primitive church, which is everywhere evident in Paul's correspondence, explains something of this reverence for prophets, and leads one to suppose that appointments to office in the primitive church were regarded less as sacramental ordinations than the due recognition of various *charismata* which God had poured out upon each community (I Cor. 12: 9-11, 28).

The development of the mon-episcopate as a sacramental order which guaranteed the validity of baptisms and eucharists and guarded the church's tradition, followed two general lines which are reflected in the literature around the turn of the century. The Pastoral Epistles (? 120 A.D.) embody a tradition that Paul appointed Timothy and Titus to supervise the local congregations in Ephesus and Crete, and to ordain presbyters over whom they were to exercise jurisdiction. In other communities where no such tradition was preserved, the bodies of elders carried on (e.g. Rome, Corinth, Philippi, Alexandria). Convenience soon led to the appointment of one of them as a kind of chairman. Church business came to be concentrated in his hands and the significance of his fellows gradually decreased. From these two developments the mon-episcopate grew to be universal by the middle of the second century. The bishop (a title then reserved for this superior officer) was, of course, the bishop of a congregation, not of a diocese. The diocesan episcopate arose from the missionary expansion of the church when neighboring villages were Christianized and their churches came under the control of the cities where Christianity had first developed. One bishop to one city was axiomatic, the *polis* being the center of ecclesiastical no less than of civil organization. The bishop's importance was correspondingly enhanced and the presbyters regained something of their former position as the clergy in charge of congregations, though they were subject to the bishops.

From this a number of things become relatively clear.

(a) A succession in the ministry was guarded, probably first by appointment and later by the laying on of hands.

(b) The right of instituting others in this succession changed. At first the body of presbyter-bishops would do it; later only the bishops, though candidates continued to be chosen by popular election.

(c) It is right to talk of "poly-episcopacy" (i.e. the college of presbyters) in the primitive church. It is also needful to stress that the limitation of ordination to the mon-episcopate is a second century change in the original pattern of church government. The practices of "con-celebration" and "con-ordination" by presbyters are vestigial survivals pointing to their original equality with bishops. The reason why the presbyter could not ordain certainly arose later than the practice of limiting ordination to the bishop.

VII. THE PRESBYTERIAN MINISTRY

Why can only a bishop ordain? There are two famous answers to this question. In the Western church, during the best period of scholasticism and until Duns Scotus, it was customary to regard the episcopate as an *ordo jurisdictionis*, not as a sacramental order able to imprint an indelible character. This view rested partly on Jerome's understanding of the original identity of the two orders, but it was based particularly on the fact that both presbyter and bishop could celebrate the mass—the highest value in the medieval hierarchy. The bishop enjoyed a superior power and order of jurisdiction; but he did not differ from the priest in having any higher sacramental character. Quite a number of later scholastics followed out the logic of this position and claimed that with papal warrant a priest could ordain a priest, because it was possible for any person to impart his own *ordo* to another in ordination.

The Eastern church on the other hand, and the Roman church

since Morinus (seventeenth century), have claimed that the bishop's power is not merely one of jurisdiction. It derives from an apostolic warrant, which was handed down from the apostles through a sacramental order of bishops who were always distinct from presbyters. Neither view does justice to the *charismatic* outlook of the primitive church, but the former has more historical basis than the latter. The Presbyterian theory is merely an interpretation of the ancient medieval tradition in the structure of Reformation theology. In the place of the *sacerdotium* to perform the mass, the presbyter bishop has the authority of Christ to preach the Word and administer the sacraments.

The question whether Presbyterianism has guarded a true succession of presbyter-bishops by ordination or even appointment from Roman priests in her ministry cannot be answered with historical assurance. The standards of Presbyterianism have never made such a claim, though some seventeenth century Puritan divines did advance a theory of *successio presbyterorum*. The laying on of hands was dispensed with in Knox's *First Book of Discipline* (1560) but it was restored by the General Assembly in 1581. The point is not of great importance, seeing that we do not know if the original presbyter-bishops of the primitive church were ordained. Since 1581 ordination has been the customary means of making ministers in the Presbyterian church. Admission to the office of minister in 1560 was by consent of the congregation, approbation of "learned ministers," and the declaration of the "chief minister." The proportion of former Roman priests in the ranks of the first Reformation clergy in Scotland cannot be accurately gauged. All six framers of the *First Book of Discipline* seem to have been Roman priests. About five former Roman bishops adopted the principles of the Reformation. The first General Assembly numbered forty-two members, of whom six were ministers. Of these six, four were Roman priests.

Discussions of succession are for the most part fruitless unless the term is very widely defined. The urgency of the Reforma-

tion can certainly justify those Roman priests who adopted the Reformation principles (and who on the medieval theory had the intrinsic right of ordination) in appointing clergy in those days of crisis. Whether all such appointments could be directly traced back to Rome does not seem to be a very relevant question, since the Reformers were more anxious to restore the church to its New Testament heritage than to wring from the medieval priests a mysterious power they did not believe in. To them the succession that was important was a succession of Christian thought and life grounded in the Word of God and in the administration of the two sacraments by duly appointed ministers. It was not for nothing that they broke away from Rome.

VIII. THE PROBLEM OF THE EUCHARIST

It is impossible to enter fully into this question, which I have dealt with at greater length in my book.⁶ In the standards of the two churches it is important to notice that both affirm the Augustinian definition of a sacrament (Larger Catechism, Question 163; Offices of Instruction, *Book of Common Prayer*, page 292), and stress its *objectivity* (Larger Catechism, Question 172; Confession of Faith 27: 3; Article 26). Its importance lies not so much in what *we* do as in what *God* does according to His promise. That *faith* is the means whereby we receive the Body of Christ (Larger Catechism, Question 170; Article 28), and that we feed on Him not in a carnal or corporeal but in a spiritual manner, is affirmed by both churches (Larger Catechism, Question 170; Article 28). Transubstantiation and the *manducatio impiorum* are contrary to the teachings of Anglicans and Presbyterians alike (Confession of Faith 29: 6 and 8; Articles 28 and 29). The affinities between the two standards are due to the fact that the Westminster fathers had our Catechism and Articles before them and frequently adopted their language. There is nothing farther from the truth than that Presbyterianism teaches "Zwinglianism" or that the Lord's Supper is a bare commemora-

⁶ *The Sacrament of Reunion*, ch. 4.

tion of the Last Supper. "Zwinglianism," it may also be noted, has very little to do with Zwingli.⁷

The differences between the Anglican and the Presbyterian eucharist are not doctrinal differences in the standards. They are due more to the practice than to the thought of the two churches, though individual ministers of both may in their private opinions have departed widely from the teachings of their communions. Presbyterians sit to receive the sacrament, while we kneel; they celebrate less frequently than we do; they use individual cups and grape juice instead of one chalice and wine; their minister wears a black gown instead of vestments; he takes the Westward instead of the Eastward position at the celebration; and the Presbyterian liturgy, unlike ours, is voluntary. Some of these points are minor ones, as for example the use of individual cups. The meaning of a single chalice is lost in the celebration in our larger churches, where we often have two or three. The difference between grape juice and wine is a fine scholastic point, seeing that the unfermented juice (*mustum*) was valid matter in the Middle Ages. A black gown differs from vestments in the *date* of the costume. Our vestments are the outdoor costume of the fifth century Roman—a chasuble (*casula*) is an overcoat, an alb is an indoor tunic. The gown is either the medieval scholar's gown or the outdoor gown of the sixteenth century bourgeoisie. Worn with a cassock it represents the priest's outdoor habit in the Middle Ages.

The Westward position was, of course, the original one in the Christian church. The architecture of several primitive churches

⁷ It derives from the most liberal period of Zwingli's writings, 1524-1528, when he was accustomed to stress the commemorative aspect of the Supper at the expense of deeper aspects which occur in his other writings. An excellent modern account of the Presbyterian approach to the eucharist is to be found in P. Carnegie Simpson's *The Fact of the Christian Church*, ch. 3. His emphasis upon the meaning of the rite as something which God does for us through Christ, rather than something we or the priests do, has many happy parallels in Luther's *Babylonish Captivity of the Church*. Attention may also be drawn to his citation of *Cuius (convivii) ipse et hospes est et epulum* from Zwingli (p. 83).

(e.g. St. Clement at Rome) attests this.⁸ In the Church of England the Northward position demanded by the rubric looks back to the early Reformation period, when the Lord's Table was moved to the body of the church for communion. Nowadays, when the altar is located in the east end of the chancel, the Northward position is as awkward as it is lacking in meaning. There can be little doubt that the Eastward position now customary in the Protestant Episcopal church is quite in accord with our rubric, though it may not be strictly legal in the Church of England. It was purposely abandoned by the Reformers because of its connection with the Sacrifice of the Mass, as if the priest stood between God and the people pleading the oblation of the *hostia immaculata*. Its legality was defended by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1890, but denied in the famous Purchas Judgment. Our own understanding of the Eastward position depends on precisely how we interpret the eucharistic sacrifice, a term that can have many different senses. In the early church it referred to the oblation of the bread and wine as a thank-offering to God (*eucharistia*) for creation and redemption. In our own consecration prayer and in the teaching of Presbyterianism the essential meaning of the eucharistic sacrifice is the appropriation of the benefits of Calvary, and in response we offer our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and present ourselves as a holy and living sacrifice to God. Anglicans and Presbyterians alike affirm that through the eucharist Christ is present, nourishing the faithful church with His body and blood. If He is there, working through the action which He Himself has commanded, and to which He has attached His promises, then the whole spiritual reality of His sacrifice is present. It is not only something that happened once for all on Calvary, but it has about it that transcendent and timeless quality which is basic to the Christian confession that in the Passion of our Lord the Eternal and the Temporal were at one.

The voluntary liturgy in Presbyterianism (*Book of Common Worship*, pages 64ff) is derived from various sources. Some of its wording is taken from our own Prayer Book. Its structure

⁸ It is still retained at St. Peter's when the Pope celebrates High Mass.

includes the *sursum corda*, Preface, Sanctus, and an Epiclesis. The account of the Institution, however, precedes all these and is read from I Corinthians 11, as in all Reformed rites.⁹ It is devoutly to be hoped that the closer relations between the two churches will lead to a deeper feeling in Presbyterianism for the liturgical tradition of Christendom. The infrequent communion in the Reformed churches was largely imposed by political authorities whom Calvin and his associates were unable to resist. A return to the great founder of Presbyterianism, who urged weekly celebrations, might be urged upon Presbyterians.

IX. CONCLUSION

The Concordat attempts to solve the perennial problem of church unity faced by Anglicanism through a scheme which does justice to three important factors. Firstly, to its tradition, by making explicit what lies behind Canon 11 and is consonant with the opinions of its early theologians, and by preserving the historic episcopate. Secondly, to Christian charity and modern scholarship, by not reading out of the church all those who have differed from its polity through the centuries, and by refusing to press dogmatic claims that historical investigation cannot adequately support. Thirdly, to ecumenical Christianity, by envisaging a United Church which will preserve the comprehensive spirit of Anglicanism in theological interpretation and do violence neither to its own standards nor to those of Presbyterianism.

The Concordat, moreover, makes a most significant advance in ecumenical thinking on the church by proposing a rite which may not unfitly be called a Sacrament of Reunion, through which our divisions can be repaired and the fuller life of the church be realized. What the Concordat refuses to do is to tie the church down to any form of fundamentalism—be it in the realm of scripture or of the episcopate. Rather does it presage a fruitful era

⁹ One may draw attention to the best of modern eucharistic liturgies in the Free Churches. It is the form used in the Canadian United Church (*Book of Common Order*, pp. 75ff). Its Canon is not unlike our own and is a great advance upon the English *Book of Common Prayer*.

of more intimate relations between the two churches, providing at once a sanction and an occasion for their closer cooperation. Through us something of the richness of Catholic liturgical life and feeling can be grafted into the Protestant movement, while from the Presbyterians we can learn much about good preaching and the doctrine of the Word of God. Thus we shall set out in a small but not unimportant way on that long journey to organic union when the church will realize more fully in history that unity which she claims as essential to her transcendent nature.

Questions for Discussion

1. What are the terms of the Concordat? How far-reaching are they?
2. What are the chief roots of Anglican opposition to the Concordat? Which do you consider to be valid?
3. What are the motives behind this opposition? How far are they justified?
4. What are the chief differences between Anglicanism and Presbyterianism? Are they complementary or antithetical?
5. What values does each church stand to gain by closer relations with the other?
6. Can Presbyterianism teach us something about preaching and the place of the Bible in our religious life? If so, what?
7. Can we teach Presbyterianism something about the episcopate and the sacraments? If so, what?
8. Is our Canon 11.6 in line with the Concordat's view of Presbyterian orders?
9. What has Anglicanism taught about non-episcopal orders in the past?
10. What place does the Concordat hold in the development of ecumenical thinking? Does it offer a practical solution to the problem of orders? Does it set an important precedent?
11. Does the Concordat presage an era of more fruitful cooperation between the two churches?
12. Could we live the Christian life more effectively and completely through the organic union of the two churches? If so, how?
13. Is Christianity endangered in our modern world? Is it important for Christians to rally their forces and stand together against the rival religions of national socialism, communism and materialism? If so, will the Concordat help us to do this?

Bibliography

I. THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

First World Conference on Faith and Order, Lausanne, 1927 (ed. Bate), Doran, 1927.

Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, 1937 (ed. Hodgson), Macmillan, 1938.

Christendom (Quarterly American Journal), Autumn, 1937.

Slosser, G. J., *Christian Unity*, Dutton, 1929.

Douglas, H. P., *Decade of Objective Progress in Church Unity, 1927-1936*, Harper, 1937.

Outline of a Reunion Scheme (Church of England and Free Churches), pamphlet, S. C. M., 1938.

The Ministry and the Sacraments (ed. Headlam and Dunkerley), Macmillan, 1937.

Union of Christendom (ed. Bishop of Brechin), Macmillan, 1938.

Simpson, C., *A Liberal Anglo-Catholic's Approach to the Proposed Concordat*, 1940 (pamphlet, obtainable from Rev. F. Kepler, 49 W. 20 St., New York).

Richardson, C. C., *The Sacrament of Reunion*, Scribners, 1940.

II. THE STANDARDS OF PRESBYTERIANISM

Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., Philadelphia, 1939.

Special attention should be paid to the following documents which it contains: (Westminster) *Confession of Faith*, *Larger Catechism*, *Form of Government*.

The Book of Common Worship (for voluntary use), Philadelphia, 1933.

III. THE STANDARDS OF ANGLICANISM

The Book of Common Prayer (according to the use of the P. E. C.), Oxford, 1929. Special attention should be paid to *Offices of Instruction*, pp. 283-95; *Articles of Religion*, pp. 577-84.

The Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church, 1937.

IV. WORKS ON HISTORY, DOCTRINE, AND LITURGY

Anglicanism (ed. More and Cross), Morehouse, 1935. (Contains excerpts from seventeenth-century Anglican writers.)

Burn-Murdoch, H., *Presbytery and Apostolic Succession*, pamphlet, S. P. C. K., 1939. (Has excellent references to Presbyterian writing on the episcopate and Apostolic Succession.)

Christian Worship (ed. Micklem), Oxford, 1936.

Doctrine in the Church of England (Report of the Archbishop's Commission), S. P. C. K., 1938.

Episcopacy Ancient and Modern (ed. Jenkins and Mackenzie), S. P. C. K., 1938.

Hanzsche, W. T., *The Presbyterians, The Story of a Staunch and Sturdy People* (popular), 1934.

Hodges, Charles, *The Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.*, 2 vols., 1839-40.

Liturgy and Worship (ed. Clarke and Harris), S. P. C. K., 1933.

McEwen, H., *A History of the Church of Scotland*, 2 vols., Hodder and Stoughton, 1915-18.

Manross, W. W., *A History of the American Episcopal Church*, Morehouse, 1935.

Moffatt, J., *The Presbyterian Churches*, New York, 1928.

Mason, A. J., *The Church of England and Episcopacy*, Cambridge, 1934.

Parsons and Jones, *The American Prayer Book*, Scribners, 1937.

Patterson, M. W., *A History of the Church of England*, Longmans, 1929.

Richardson, C. C., *The Church through the Centuries*, Scribners, 1938.

Simpson, P. Carnegie, *The Fact of the Christian Church*, Revell, 1935.

Thompson, R. E., *A History of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States* (American Church History Series), 1895.

White, C. W., *Constitution and Canons for the Government of the P. E. C.*, annotated with exposition, 1924.

V. THE EARLY CHURCH

Early History of the Church and Ministry (ed. Swete), Macmillan, 1921.

Gore, C., *The Church and the Ministry* (revised by Turner), S. P. C. K., 1936.

Grant, F. C., *The Nature of the Church; I. Historical Origins* (Church Congress Syllabus, IV. 1; ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, July 1939).

Lietzmann, H., *The Beginnings of the Church*, Scribners, 1937; *The Founding of the Church Universal*, Scribners, 1938.

Lindsay, T. M., *The Church and Ministry in the Early Centuries*, Doubleday, Doran, 1924.

Streeter, B. H., *The Primitive Church*, Macmillan, 1929.

SOCIAL TRAINING FOR THE PASTORAL MINISTRY

By JOSEPH F. FLETCHER

The Graduate School of Applied Religion, Cincinnati

I. INTRODUCTION

The title of this paper implies the limits, the chief emphases, and something of the philosophy of social training for the pastoral ministry.

(1) The word "Social" reveals our appreciation of the essential quality of present-day human existence, of the nature of the field in which the Church's task of redemption lies, and of the need to see and embrace human souls in their total situation.

(2) Use of the word "Training" instead of Education indicates that the emphasis in this discussion will be placed upon the "practical," and especially upon the pastoral, aspects of the theological curriculum, rather than upon its academic aspects. It emphasizes the one; it does not minimize the other.

(3) The word "Pastoral" itself shows that we are concerned primarily with the "service" and "shepherding" phases of priesthood rather than with its preaching and liturgical-sacramental offices.

(4) Finally, we are interested in the Ministry. Much of what will be said applies in some degree to any course of professional training, especially for those professions which lie in the area of Human Relations. We are concerned with all conditions and facilities of training, however, only insofar as they are relevant to the needs of the clergy and prove themselves worthy of incorporation into the work of the ministry and of the Church.

II. THE AIM OF THIS PAPER

This paper will take up three main questions: (1) The *philosophy* of social training for the pastoral ministry, (2) its *purposes*,

and (3) some of the *suggestions* which may be regarded as essential to a successful program. These suggestions will be with respect to Prerequisites, Courses of Study, Clinical Facilities, Supervision, Interpretation and other concrete details. Unfortunately, the paper will not be as circumstantial as thoroughness would require, due to limitations of space.

III. THE PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL TRAINING

The basic characteristic of social life is change (not "progress"). Changes in social and cultural patterns require consonant changes in the methods of those who are professionally concerned with human welfare, whether in its material or spiritual phases or both. Society, and therefore all human relations within it, forms a modifying organism and not a static or "given" structure. This remains true of the Church's ministry, in its task of personal and social salvation, as of any other order. Here we have the "key principle" of what is developed in this paper.

Our knowledge of the nature of social process should keep us ever alert to the changing conditions which influence Christian ministry, rendering it relatively effective or ineffective. In the light of this "dynamic" principle as it affects all educational enterprises, we can reasonably and continually urge that formal theological education be vitalized, socialized and (in the truest, Christian sense) humanized.

Realization of these purposes should not displace any subject in the approved theological curriculum. The subjects listed in Canon 4 as a normal standard of learning and examination are definitely a minimum. However, a more dynamic way of presenting some of them would give these a greater practical unity.

There is no good reason to slight the academic subjects in our seminaries in any way. Familiarity with the tradition and experience of the living Church must inform the work of the clergy at all times. "To walk straight we must think straight." Nevertheless, within the period of seminary training, usually three years, there is a disproportionate emphasis on the biblical, his-

torical and dogmatic subjects, at the expense of the others. The so-called "practical" subjects, like homiletics, pastoral theology, casuistry, liturgics, ascetics and parish administration, fail to receive enough attention or an intelligent reference to the changing realities of contemporary living. We are all familiar with the kind of institution in which I once heard the dean say, "I teach religious education, pastoral care, liturgics, and the other extras!"

It would seem that the principle underlying some of our theological education today is that the student enters his training course to learn, *first*, What the Christian tradition is; and *second*, How to apply it to real-life situations. Consequently the course is divided into two parts: (1) the academic, which is biblical, historical, dogmatic and apologetic; and (2) the practical, which may consist of various things in various institutions, covering usually only from four weeks to a semester of four-and-a-half months. This second part is marked by instability and constant experiment. In terms of our own philosophy it must always be changing, of course, but the impression still remains that part of the change is due to superficial consideration rather than to any sensitive relevance to the social process. In fact, I am willing to throw out the assertion that the second part of the training course is superficial and therefore in error, and that its error lies partly in ignoring the findings of the modern social sciences, and partly in assuming that we can learn a thing first and then practice it afterwards. The business of learning method (which is the care of technical or professional training) when it is unrelated to experience *pari passu*, is futile. This is an error which is rejected by all modern educational theory, but it persists in some degree in most theological schools. The question raised here regarding clinical or field work will be discussed later.

In this connection it will be well to consider seriously the functional importance of a distinction between theological "education" and theological "training." This distinction is articulated in the curricula of the English Church where the academic subjects are studied in the University and the so-called "practical"

ones in the Theological College or "training School." Our American seminaries by comparison are trying to combine both courses in a three-year program, with the result that the academic frame of reference (important as it is) unfortunately often permits our junior clergy to enter upon their duties pathetically innocent of the practical techniques involved. A widespread mild melancholia among the more vital and intelligent of them, especially the isolated or "independent" ones, is proof of this pudding.

Pastoral Theology, as both theory and practice, needs a new orientation and fresh criticism most drastically of all. The "sheep" with whom the pastoral office is concerned are social beings. It is the pastor's task to deal with them *in their total social situation*. Pastoral Theology at present most certainly does not take enough rational account of the psycho-sociological problems which surround the work of ministry. Our pastors should not try to become social work experts, but they should have at least a lay knowledge of community organization, good case work and sound group work. "Case work," for example, is only the practical application of Pastoral Theology, as casuistry is of the principles of Moral Theology!

Why couldn't our instructors in pastoral theology maintain an active association with accredited schools of social work, for the sake of commerce between the two faculties? (The benefits would not be one-sided!) Where schools of social work are near our theological schools our students should be encouraged to go to them for electives and extra-curricular studies, perhaps on a basis of exchangeable credits.

The truths of our Christian Faith are eternal truths. But in an unredeemed world, subject to the relativities of history and social process, the Church's work is always conditioned by the "world" it tries to redeem. Its tactics are not fixed like the laws of the Medes and Persians. Christian programs of service and evangelism must keep step with the fortunes of its "war," a war which, for the Church militant, never stands still or finds armistice short of the Kingdom of God.

IV. PURPOSES

Social training for the pastoral ministry, rightly conceived, aims to equip our clergy for more effective leadership and more effective contributions to the Christianization of human life, personal and social. It assumes with F. H. Bradley, at the outset, that "society without the individual is no more an abstraction than the individual without society." It conceives of human nature as at once both personal and social. In spite of our emphasis upon the importance of social conditions, we insist that in the end it is the immortal treasure of man's soul which is important, and that man is always more important than any social theories about him or social orders for him. And yet it is an all-important fact that, as civilization becomes more inter-dependent, man's salvation is social.

Regarding man as a social and personal being, we realize that even in our private ministrations, even as we individualize human needs, our approach must be social. We learn from other (secular) welfare workers, who have developed a tremendous area of scientific theory and experience, that even case work (individual service) must be social case work! Therapy, whether it is religious, psychological or physical, must take competent note of *the total social situation* of the personality served. It means, if modern pastoral care is to be successful and maintain its very existence, that it must be as adequately informed as secular (and competitive) "pastoral service" about mental hygiene, delinquency, pastoral medicine, family case work, case work method, community agencies both public and private, and several other subjects. We certainly cannot abstract souls from their social environment.

Properly trained clergy will also be equipped with some knowledge of the principles and methods of group work. Since much of the average parish program is given over to group work organization, this becomes a vital need. And from the pastoral viewpoint as well as the administrative viewpoint, our clergy need to understand the working relations between case work and group

work, in order to capitalize on the tremendous opportunities for intensive pastoral care which are revealed by intelligent group work. Knowledge of these matters has gone far beyond the "common sense" which seems to be thought good enough in many of our training programs.

Just as our clergy must be trained in social work methods, in order to deal with individuals, families or larger units, so do they need rational training in the nature of social structure, and in methods of dealing with its problems. Courses in Christian sociology are as important as courses in pastoral theology. The two hang together, or separately! Problems of delinquency, for example, bring our pastors to grips with family case-work and the group-work problem of recreational facilities, but always beyond these things lies the question of employment, and ultimately therefore of prices, wages and profits. In these days of great change the clergy, without some sociological interpretation, are like blind men with no protection but Jericho! The walls of Jericho could not stand.

The point here is that the Christian minister is not merely concerned with social adjustment. He must also have some rational view of social justice. He must understand, clearly and circumstantially, what the social structure is and how it determines his people's conditions of life. Recent recognition, for instance, of the bearing of urban sociology upon parish program building is a high light of Christian sociology. The work of the Lynds, Swift, Kincheloe, Leiffer, Douglass and Brunner are the fruit of religious statesmanship when it comes to terms with the realities of modern community living. Just as a knowledge of urban sociology is essential, so is some rational understanding of national and world institutions.

Incidentally, when I say "Christian sociology" I do not mean "Christian social ethics." Ethics, taken alone, tends too much to moralize and fails to come to terms with history and reality. Are we merely "pedestrian" or "uninspired" if we try to include the data of social change as well as the principles which we as Christians feel should be applied? Opinions, even Christian

opinions, are no better than the facts they reflect. Our principles must be translated into programs, or else we shall continue to appear suspiciously opportunistic and really unprincipled! Concrete lines of action and effort are the only clear proofs of conviction. Faith requires works as well as witness. But once we enter upon the concrete, the historical plane of existence, we find that facts are the only frame of reference, the only soil in which to build our programs.

The time has come, beyond any doubt, when Christian social thinking must "materialize" its doctrines. Our Christian political principles, for example, must become *Realpolitik*. In this way we learn the meaning of Canon Scott Holland's remark, "The more one believes in the Incarnation, the more one cares about drains." Christian social ethics, as it has thus far developed, has remained largely in the realm of the abstractions of a pious social philosophy. Perhaps this has been necessary and proper, but if it is prolonged beyond the point where the law of diminishing returns begins to operate it will become sterile! The Church wants to redeem the world more than to advise it, and to solve its problems more than to moralize them. In this respect at least we can say with Karl Marx, "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world; the point however is to change it." (Here, incidentally, is the root difference between religion and philosophy!)

Christian social teaching should now enter upon a new phase; shall we say its quantitative phase? It is time now to enter more deliberately into the "meat" of such questions as: How religion and crime show striking relations to the size of cities; wherein large cities discourage marriage and families; why there are more women than men (dear rector!); the relation between Church school attendance and the falling population curve; how it is that church support goes down and recreation expense goes up—a host of vital matters and mortal misinformation.

Recognizing the problems of social structure as well as of social work, of course, simply reminds us that the prophetic office is as much a part of ministry as the pastoral office, and that the two are bound together for truth's sake and victory. Psychologists, with

their concern for integrated personality, tell us to "get right" with ourselves; sociologists, preoccupied with social relations, tell us to "get right" with each other; economists, anxious for a stable relation to wealth, tell us to "get right" with our material resources; the Church, eager to keep men in touch with spiritual realities, tells us to "get right" with God. *All* of these demands must be seen as a single rational pattern of the Good Life. None is more important than the others; failure in any one destroys success in the others.

V. SUGGESTIONS

We might, for the purpose of a concrete discussion, throw out some suggestions for the improvement of our theological training. Their value will not appear equally to all and discussion may completely discredit some of them. I do not offer any suggestion dogmatically, but rather experimentally, as a result of some experience and much thought.

A. *Authority*.—The Church has little direct control at present over any of our training schools except the General Theological Seminary in New York City. But its wishes and demands can be given the power of sanction, an indirect control, through the Canon setting forth requirements to be imposed by Boards of Examining Chaplains. They, or perhaps Standing Committees, could be directed to require a more social and realistic course of training for admission to Holy Orders.

Canon 6, regulating Boards of Examining Chaplains, should be revised with the idea of reforming the widespread indifference and slipshod practices of many boards. Surely this can be done without "invading the states' rights" of the several dioceses!

Technically, the Church does not officially or canonically recognize the existence of our seminaries. We might decide that some sort of authoritative sanctions and standards are desirable. In some respects the present arrangement whereby Examining Chaplains and seminaries carry on without reference to each other is pointless and repetitious. We remember that the General Convention's Joint Commission on Theological Education, impotent as it is, would like any suggestions and welcome any support.

B. Revision of Canon 4.—The standard of subjects at present in Canon 4 is good as far as it goes.

Item 5, Section 1 (Christian Ethics and Moral Theology), is certainly a course which is subject intensely and constantly to change and social process. Much of our Christian ethics is ivory-towerish and abstracted from practical issues. Therefore it is not developed with sufficient bearing upon the actual present-day problems of Right and Duty. Moral Theology is not even taught in some seminaries, to say nothing of a casuistry relevant to the "facts of life" and problems of conscience besetting modern men and women. Young graduates have nothing better to give their people and penitents in moral quandaries than the usual vague rule-of-thumb "dictates of conscience." This is an evasion of their parishioner's needs.

Christian Ethics and Moral Theology cannot be brought to bear upon the issues of these times, either, until those who teach it make a more serious study in the light of the social sciences, particularly in the field of economic and juridical cases.

I have already remarked on the item Pastoral Care, and its inadequate presentation. It will be mentioned again in connection with clinical training.

Section I, item 9 (Elective Subjects), gives us a good opportunity to socialize and vitalize the training course. Items (d), (e) and (k), (Sociology, Psychology and Specialized Work), indicate points at which tremendous reform and development can be made. Sociology and Psychology should absolutely be raised from "electives" to a required place in the curriculum.

C. Prerequisites.—Theological teachers should attempt more detailed advice as to undergraduate college study, for candidates who know soon enough that they will enter Orders. We might go a lot farther in integrating academic and professional studies.

With respect to testing a candidate's vocation, we might agree:

1. That a modified social-psychiatric test be given to all postulants, aimed to discover vocational aptitudes and not merely a personality study.

2. That a similar test be made part of the final examination before ordination. This would help save the wasted money, time, frustration and spiritual loss of clerical misfits. Our need is to be firmer about standards of admission, even if more coercion of "easy bishops" is necessary.

3. That greater weight be given to the recommendations of theological schools with regard to a student's aptitudes. After all, they do the real testing.

4. That bishops should be prevented from accepting candidates already rejected by another bishop, or at least to consult seriously with him. There are too many backdoors to the priesthood!

D. Courses of Study.—I am not clear which of the courses of study I am about to suggest might be inserted into the seminary curriculum and which should be given only in a place like the Graduate School. In other words, it is an open question whether the Graduate School is a challenge to the seminaries or an auxiliary course necessary in the very nature of things. In any case, if these suggestions are valid it is clear that something more in the way of social training for the pastoral ministry is required than the seminaries now provide.

Following are seven courses which we may call a minimum standard:

1. *PROBLEMS OF CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY.*—To survey the field of modern economic, political, and cultural problems, relating them to Christian doctrine as well as ethnics. Information as well as criticism is presented. The aim is at specifically Christian interpretation.

2. *HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL THOUGHT AND WORK.*—A survey of the Church's experience, aiming at an honest recognition of new problems as well as an intelligent appreciation of the contemporary value of traditional thought and practice.

3. *COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION.*—A study of the nature of the modern community (whether rural or urban), its structure, growing edges, its facilities for human welfare, public and private, and methods of referral and coöperation between priest, parish and agencies.

4. *PASTORAL THEOLOGY AND SOCIAL WORK.*—A factual study of the philosophy, area, method and resources of modern expert service, especially where social self-maintenance has broken down, in relation to the problems and character of pastoral work. Aimed at a correct use of case work methods and a wise exploitation of secular resources. Case materials are analyzed.

5. **THE PARISH AND THE COMMUNITY.**—A study of the principles of parish program building and administration, in the light of the community's structure and organization. Relevant findings of urban or rural sociology are explored, and actual programs analyzed.

6. **ETHICAL EVALUATIONS.**—A study of current social issues, whether in personal or social contexts, aiming at a Christian moral evaluation, and using prepared reports. Propaganda devices, religious and secular, are analyzed.

7. **SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF PASTORAL CARE.**—An advanced course with special emphasis upon personal counselling and intensive case work treatment, as related to mental hygiene, psychiatry and the dynamics of personality. Problems of ascetical theology and casuistry are related.

Other courses which are refinements or extensions of these materials could be suggested. In fact, they are now given in the Graduate School, but considerable study would be necessary to determine how much, if any, is generally adaptable to theological schools.

It may be that the fourth year of theological training will some day be accepted. Other professions have long required that much, and more. But even then it is a question whether these courses are practicable in the average seminary's location and set-up, especially if we view the problem in the light of our next question, clinical and field work.

E. Clinical and Field Training.—The facilities required for clinical training are obvious. We need social agencies, competently staffed, in both the public and private fields. Some of them should be general or family case work agencies, others should be special services in child care, delinquency, rehabilitation, mental hygiene, domestic relations and so on. A few institutions, especially for the sick (physically and mentally) and the aged, should be available. Trade union organizations are occasionally an asset. All of them should be competently and professionally staffed, aware of the student's needs and purposes, in touch with their theological teachers, and willing to provide student-supervision as well as staff conferences.

I would suggest that social agencies have a higher training value than institutions, except for those students who plan a specialized ministry as institutional priests in chaplaincies. The average student will be going into parish work and should train accord-

ingly. As a parish priest his opportunities for leadership and service lie in the open community, while institutionalized clients become type-personalities and their pastoral care assumes the patterns of institutional life. The institutional "parish" is a thing in itself.

In the Summer Session of the Graduate School, which is attended by seminarians in course elsewhere, we place seven or eight students in institutions, usually upon their own request. The peculiar and isolating features of their work we overcome by requiring them to live in the dormitory with others who are in different community organizations, and they all attend the same classes and lectures, thereby exchanging experience and profiting from common discussion and class work. This is a fundamentally important feature of the learning process in clinical training courses for theological students.

We must never overlook the fact that in the clinical aspects of pastoral training the *interpretation* is as important a part in the process as the *participation*. This is why such care must be taken in the selection and variation of placements, and such pains taken to establish and maintain adequate supervision of the field work. There is no greater fallacy than the idea that students benefit merely by the "experience." Without interpretation they may only suffer boredom, if not downright indigestion! In the classroom phases, it is most important to develop theoretical and analytical materials in relation to the current practice of the student's field work. Case work reports are of immense reality and value.

In Cincinnati our summer students do a minimum of 330 field work hours. In each of the three quarters of the Graduate School course our students do 240 hours, or 720 for the course. This is a minimum requirement for effective training, as we observe it and as the field agencies advise us. In connection with this point there arises the problem of *continuity*. Most of the value of clinical work depends upon its freedom from interruption, for whole days at a time if at all possible. This is why I raised the question, above, as to how adaptable a practical or "internship" course would be to the conditions of academic seminary work.

It may well be that a sound clinical training course is best pursued after the academic background has been acquired, as we hold it to be at the Graduate School.

One more word about interpretation and supervision. The interpretation must include an integrated course of materials, and students should attend regular and frequent lectures by experts in various fields. By this means their training is not narrowed to one thing only, and they can evaluate their own activities in relation to other fields. The supervisors under whom they work should appreciate that the students are not trying to become social workers but good priests.

F. Location of Theological Institutions.—The location of our schools is of paramount importance. This is an *urban* civilization. Training for other professions has long since been settled in large cities or developed communities where facilities for trial and practice are easily available. Much of our theological training is still carried on in places far removed from the concrete materials and "laboratories" of modern life. Population resources are indispensable. Men studying for a rural ministry need all the urban facilities, plus training in rural economics and sociology, if they are to give rural leadership.

The point is illustrated in the experience of one of our Church schools which tried for awhile to maintain a College of Medicine. Its isolation led to a change of scene for the medical college a quarter of a century ago. But the Theological School is still there, trying to fulfill its training function remote from the setting in which its students will fulfill their ministry!

G. Advanced Theological Training.—The "fourth year" of theological training has been mentioned as a possible and desirable development. This might be carried out at a seminary, depending upon its conditions, or at a Graduate School especially set up for that purpose. In any case, it should be developed as an internship. The theory of the diaconate year as a period of apprenticeship has been abandoned in practice. At present the diaconate is a failure in placing and supervising the initial experience of the clergy. Bishops rush junior clergy into a "work"

for the sake of short-term executive needs and without regard to the long-term effects upon the young ordinand's whole ministry. Here is a case where haste makes waste!

Theological students must be encouraged to serve their diaconate year under adequate supervision, modeled to fit their special needs, where the initial experience with real-life situations can proceed with further study dynamically related to their practice. *Learning by doing is the only reliable process.* However, curacies with "successful rectors" do not by any means always, or even rarely, provide the beginner with all that he should have. Planned internship, such as the Graduate School course, is just as necessary in the parson's transition from gown to town as it is in the doctor's.

We shall have to give serious thought to the problem of advanced and graduate study, in both "academic" and "practical" subjects. It should be possible for seminary graduates to receive academic recognition (degrees) for study and investigation properly pursued away from their seminaries. The research necessary to develop a fine Pastoral Theology must in the nature of the case be carried out away from the seminaries in many fields. Higher degrees in divinity should be available for work done under adequate supervision, as is the case at the Graduate School. At present in Cincinnati we are exploring the possibility of taking up some small part of the valuable work which ceased several years ago when the Institute of Social and Religious Studies was closed.

H. *Final Word.*—As a final comment, but in no sense a conclusion to the problems which have been raised, let me say this: It should be obvious to the Church, and especially to those of us concerned with the Church's program of social service and the content of our Christian social teaching, that the social training of our clergy for pastoral ministry is a fundamental problem in ways and means. Its solution will test the religious statesmanship of this epoch.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

By SHERMAN E. JOHNSON

Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wisconsin

The second commandment (Ex. 20: 4-6; cf. Deut. 5: 8-10) has caused considerable difficulty for scholars because it is at variance with Hebrew practice throughout almost the entire pre-exilic period. Scholars interested in an early date for the Decalogue have resorted to various devices. We can hardly maintain that the command was being willfully violated, since we have images made and worshipped in good faith until the eighth century. R. H. Charles, who in *The Decalogue* (Edinburgh, 1923) gives all the pertinent references on this point, nevertheless goes on to maintain the Mosaic origin of the command, explaining the discrepancy by supposing that it lay in abeyance from 400 to 600 years. He sees no difficulty in such a point of view, "seeing that it was deliberately explained away or ignored by the *entire Christian Church*, despite the unmistakable and universal condemnation of the worship of images in the New Testament from the seventh century to the sixteenth, that is, for 800 years; while the Roman and, in part, the Eastern Churches have treated it as null and void from the seventh General Council to the present day, that is, for over 1100 years" (p. 26). Yet Charles' analogy is not too convincing because the Christian Church reached its position in view of the commandment and in what was regarded, rightly or wrongly, as obedience to it. Likewise we do not find any suggestion that the founder of Christianity denounced the type of imagery which later was employed, as Charles' use of the analogy would necessitate.

The second suggestion, advanced by other scholars, that the commandment was a later addition, runs into the difficulty of explaining how a decalogue would admit supplementation. What

was the commandment it displaced in the list? The problem becomes even worse when we omit the fourth and tenth along with the second, as some suggest.

The third solution is, of course, to regard the Decalogue in its entirety as much later than the time of Moses. So A. H. McNeile, in *The Book of Exodus* (3rd ed., London, 1931), p. lxiii, indicates the close similarities in thought with the teaching of Hosea and Amos. It is this same second commandment that has caused McNeile to reject the theory of Mosaic authorship, although he has been able to interpret the others, even the difficult tenth, in harmony with the religious customs and ideas of the Mosaic period.

I think that we can do the same for the second. This does not mean, of course, that Moses must have written the Decalogue. It does, however, leave open the theoretical possibility of an early date for its composition. If we consider the first two commandments in relation to each other, their original meaning would have been: No other gods are to be put alongside Jahweh (v. 3), nor to be worshipped with their respective images (vv. 4-6). Jahweh was the only God and his image was the only idol to be tolerated. In support of this interpretation, it is to be noted that nowhere in vv. 4-6 is a Jahweh image explicitly mentioned. Likewise v. 23, which McNeile regards as an E parallel to vv. 3-6, would seem to refer explicitly to the making of (other) gods of silver and gold. That a commandment prohibiting other than Jahweh imagery should be extended to cover Jahweh images as well, receives a perfect parallel in Charles' own statement. The New Testament references to images are concerned with the worship of other gods. Charles mistakenly extends the references to cover the Church's use of its own holy pictures, of Jesus and the saints, and so misinterprets the restricted condemnation of images which we actually find in the New Testament!

CORWIN C. ROACH

BOOK REVIEWS

The Prayer Book Psalter Revised. By G. A. Cooke. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939, pp. xv + 195. \$1.75.

The former Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford offers a contribution toward the revision of the Psalter "which sooner or later the Church is bound to undertake." It is essentially a new translation based in part on those of Cheyne, S. R. Driver, and Wales. "Guided by the spirit of Coverdale," it is less interested in traditional renderings than in reproducing the sense of the original. Certain defects in Coverdale to be overcome are mentioned in the introduction: archaisms, a false impression given by words such as *saints*, *heathen*, and *hell*, vagueness and inconsistency, and erroneous interpretations due frequently to defective scholarship. For his translation Dr. Cooke employs the Versions, conservative conjectural emendations of the Hebrew text, and the researches into cognate Semitic roots which have appeared in recent years over the signature of G. R. Driver.

Is this work different enough from traditional translations and sufficiently well-balanced to be interesting and stimulating? The following are some of the renderings which indicate that the answer both of layman and scholar should be a cordial affirmative.

- 8:5 Thou madest him little less than divine.
- 18:4 The breakers of death came about me:
 and the torrents of destruction made me afraid.
- 19:3 Though it is not speech, neither are they words:
 their voice cannot be heard.
- 22:15 My palate is dried up like a potsherd,
 and my tongue cleaveth to my gums.
- 23:4 Yea, though I walk in a valley of deep gloom I fear no evil.
- 45:12 (13) And the daughter of Tyre shall come with a gift:
 the wealthiest people shall sue for thy favour.
- 49:11 Their graves are their homes for ever,
 their dwelling-places unto all generations.
- 73:4 For they have no torments:
 sound and lusty is their body.
- 82:1 God standeth in a divine assembly:
 in the midst of the gods he judgeth.
- 82:8 Arise, O God, judge thou the earth:
 for thou siftest all the nations.
- 100:3 He made us, and we are his.

- 126:6 He that weepeth as he goeth along, strewing the seed:
 shall indeed come home with a joyful cry, carrying his sheaves.
139:11 And if I say, Surely darkness will sweep by me.

A good translation is worthy of attempts at improvement. (1) The choice of words or expressions is occasionally questionable, e.g. 16:9 *my glory is glad*; 23:6 and 93:5 *for length of days*; 50:11 *and that which moveth in the fields*; 51:2 *thoroughly*; 54:3 *sought for my soul (life)*; 84:5 *high-praises*; 97:12 *give thanks unto his holy memorial*; 99:8 *doings (misdeeds)*.

(2) Here and there the Hebrew is capable of a different, possibly better interpretation, e.g. 46:6 *Nations raged, kingdoms were shaken: he uttered his voice, earth melted away* (render as concessive, *Though nations rage, kingdoms totter, thunder resound, earth quake, etc.*); 51:7f the verbs are not imperatives; 87:4 *I will make mention of Egypt and Babylon as them that know me (for those who know me (there))*; 101:2 *when wilt thou come to me (will it come)*; 103:9 *keep his anger (scowl, frown)*; 104:8 *the mountains rose, the valleys sank (they went up mountains, they went down valleys—the subject is still the waters, as vs. 9 shows)*; 121:3 *He cannot suffer thy foot to slip (may he not suffer)*.

(3) In several places the Versions can give further help. At 67:4a, G^N supplies a needed half line: *for thou dost govern the world righteously*. In 42:2 Syriac and Targum with some Hebrew MSS read *not appear in the presence of God but see the face of God*. A similar active verb is required in 84:7, as in 11:7. An attempt has been made in the Psalms as elsewhere to remove the idea that men see God. Cf 63:2 G. Greek additions to the Hebrew text are usually rightly rejected as in 1:4, but *continually* is mistakenly retained in 19:14.

(4) In Psalms 43–83 should *God*, which usually took the place of an original proper name (for which Dr. Cooke in most cases wisely uses *the Lord*) be retained? 77:13 is rendered, *Who is so great a god as Jehovah?* although the Hebrew reads *as God*. What is better than *Who is so great a god as the Lord?* But Dr. Cooke retains *God thy God* in 45:7, *God our God* in 48:15, and *God, even our God* in 67:6.

(5) The translator recognizes occasional glosses and repetitions in the Hebrew text, e.g. 92:11 *evil doers*; 45:4 *and thy splendour*; 108:1 *yea my glory*; 119:48 *which I have loved*; 80:15, 17 *and upon the son whom thou madest strong for thyself*. But in general he tries to represent almost everything now in the Massoretic text, as in 83:18 *And they shall know that thou alone whose name is Jehovah: art most high above all the earth*, where *thy name* is surely a gloss; in 90:17, where a half line has been mistakenly repeated; and in 130:6, where *watchmen for the morning* was originally written but once. Dr. Cooke has probably gone as far as he could in omitting words and phrases if his work is to obtain widespread or official approval.

(6) A considerable number of further emendations are highly probable, e.g.:

- 2:11f Serve the Lord with fear, and kiss his feet with trembling (not *be glad*).
36:1 Transgression is pleasant to the mind of the wicked (not *sait*).
45:6 Thy throne will endure for ever and ever (not *God*).

- 49:7 No man can ever redeem himself (not *brother*).
 72:3 And the hills righteousness (not *through righteousness*).
 73:1 Surely God is good to the upright (not *unto Israel*).
 147:17 Before whose cold the waters freeze (not *who can stand*, as the pronominal suffix *them* in the following verse shows).

Here are the beginnings of various lists. If many readers would keep and compare notes on the text and various translations of the Psalms, in the end, thanks to Dr. Cooke and others, we should have a better Psalter.

CHARLES L. TAYLOR, JR.

Personalities of the Old Testament (The Hale Lectures, 1938). By Fleming James. New York: Scribner, 1939, pp. xvi + 632. \$3.00.

"As the writer reviews this study of Israel's leaders three things stand out in his mind. One is that the religion of Israel, on which so much depended for mankind, was itself dependent on a succession of leaders extending over a thousand years. It was because these leaders somehow came as they were needed and added in each case just the impulse that was required to carry on and develop this religion that it continued its course. Their coming was no chance; it was the plan of God." Thus the author meditates, in his concluding word, upon the work which has come from his pen. The other two things which stand out in his mind, the miraculous quality of growth and survival and the factors of opposition and environment in the whole picture of development are obviously dependent upon the first reflection: the divinely sent and inspired leaders.

Thus to all intents and purposes the Bible, especially the Old Testament, becomes again, in a pagan and disbelieving world, a divinely inspired record and of a type that the modern reader finds easy to accept. Certainly as one follows the author and senses the spiritual sympathy which he feels for the great leaders of the past it is easy to feel with him God's guidance and love throughout the ages.

It is in this deeply spiritual quality and insight that the work is especially outstanding. Those of us who had the privilege of listening to the lectures as they were delivered, of breathing-in the qualities of voice and personality so richly present in the speaker, questioned even as we looked forward to the printed work whether those qualities could be preserved. We need have had no doubts; they are richly present to the reader.

It must not be thought from the title that the work is confined only to the human actors upon the stage. There is none of the oversimplification with which modern historical and biographical method is, in the mind of this reviewer, so thoroughly cursed. Dr. James never falls into the error of sensing these leaders as working in a vacuum. On the contrary the work is as full of movements as Rudolf Kittel's earlier work, *Great Men and Movements in Israel*. Indeed, in the opinion of this reviewer, Dr. James has avoided many of those pitfalls into which Dr. Kittel fell. In particular this is true in the nice distinction which guides him on the two horses of religious subjectivity and historical

objectivity. While the first is the leader, the second is never allowed to lag behind.

In spirit the book is on the conservative side. Unless well backed up by abundant opinion the well established interpretation of events as well as textual criticism is invariably chosen. Nevertheless, in practically all cases, abundant footnotes present contrary opinion. In particular, in the matter of the date and manner of the conquest of Canaan, a compendium of contrasting views is presented in an appendix. It is a thorough work and it is an honest work.

ALLEN D. ALBERT, JR.

Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten: Nahum bis Maleachi. Handbuch zum Alten Testament. By Friedrich Horst. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr—Paul Siebeck, 1933, pp. vi + 161-267. R. M. 1.20.

This publication is the continuation of the first half, appearing in 1936, which was reviewed by the present writer in this REVIEW, 1936, pp. 252 ff. The earlier section is the work of the British scholar Theodore H. Robinson, and covers Hosea-Micah. Horst's work, beginning actually at the end of the first section, continues with the remaining Minor Prophets. This section also contains at the end the prefatory material for the whole volume, title-page, etc., and also a Prefatory Note by Professor Robinson. In this he gives very generous as also well deserved credit to the editor of the series, Professor O. Eissfeldt of Halle, who made the German translation of his English composition, on which friendly task he remarks: "No one would suspect that it was a translation from a foreign language, and yet it is faultless as a presentation of what I would have said"—a characteristic indeed which the reviewer had remarked in his reading of that section; and he continues with acknowledgment of the assistance he had received throughout from the editor. It is a happiness to put on record such a fact of academic cooperation and friendliness in these days of hostility and bitter warfare. For the student this volume, now completed, will be an invaluable addition to the three large volumes on the Minor Prophets (1905-1912) in the *International Critical Commentary*. Horst notably continues Robinson's admirable work. Within the scope of 115 pages he gives translation and brief commentary and a wise selection of points of textual criticism, accompanied with excellent introductions to the individual books, as also to their several sections. It is indeed *multum in parvo*, and despite the mass of literature on the Twelve it is indispensable with its presentation of most recent criticism and of the author's own ripe results. In regard to literary criticism, the problems of age and authorship, the writer is conservative—a sign of the times, as *versus* much hitherto arbitrary dissection and down-dating. This appears in his treatment of Nahum and its much mooted sections, of Zeph. 2: 4-15 as genuine, and his finding of pre-Exilic pieces in Zech. 9-11. The latter prophet he holds to have been under the influence of Ezekiel. The excursus on 'the Scythian Problem' in Zephaniah (p. 184) is an exemplary piece of historical discussion. In the field of the prophetic psychology he allows, as in the case of Nah. 3, place for 'genuine vision' (p. 162).

J. A. MONTGOMERY

The Book of Revelation. By E. F. Scott. New York: Scribner, 1940, pp. 188. \$2.00.

In his preface the author says "[He] has kept two aims before him: first, to explain the book as clearly as he can, with regard, not so much to its obscure background, as to its immediate purpose; and, second, to discover its religious message." It may be said that he has hit both targets. No book has suffered so much at the hands of interpreters; but here is an interpretation founded on knowledge of apocalyptic literature and of the book itself and expressed with clarity and sanity. There are many felicitous illustrations, as for example, "Between Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic, there was the same kind of difference as between the old geography which allowed for a possible land beyond the ocean and the later geography which dealt with a land discovered but not yet fully explored" (p. 28). Again, "The old cathedrals were so built that on occasion they might be turned into fortresses . . . the Book of Revelation gives something of this character to the New Testament" (p. 154). Dr. Scott shows that in spite of its apparent incoherence, the book is "a deliberate work of art." In this connection even more might have been said of the remarkable symmetry of its construction, a feature which has been brought out almost to excess by Professor N. W. Lund in his *Outline Studies*, a little book which is really form criticism, unlike many books which use the term but are about something else. For example, the great enemies of the Church come on the stage in this order: (1) Death and Hades, (2) The Dragon, (3) The first and second beasts, (4) The Harlot; they are destroyed in exactly the reverse order: the Harlot first and Death and Hades last. The Epilogue like the Prologue is in three divisions and identical words and phrases occur in each division. Rome has two symbols: the Harlot and Babylon, so the Church has two symbols, the Bride and the New Jerusalem. When read as a whole to a Church in danger, this symmetry and contrast must have been impressive indeed. On page 81, A.D. 30 should be A.D. 40.

A. H. FORSTER

Philo and the Oral Law (Harvard Semitic Series, vol. xi). By Samuel Belkin. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1940, pp. xiv + 292. \$3.50.

Professor Belkin's study of 'the Philonic interpretation of biblical law in relation to the Palestinian Halakah' is an elaborate and detailed investigation, point by point, of the legal interpretations of Philo of Alexandria. It supplements his earlier *Alexandrian Halakah in the Apologetic Literature of the First Century C. E.* (1936, already reviewed), and is a work of major importance to all New Testament scholars. The question confronting New Testament research, both in the interpretation of the gospels and of St. Paul, is often this: To what extent was Diaspora Judaism identical with Palestinian—i.e. in the first century? Can Philo rightly be cited for Palestinian usage? And is Paul's background, both before his conversion to Christianity and later as a missionary to the Diaspora and to Gentiles, similar to that of Philo? Is it proper to cite Philo for 'normative' first-century Judaism? Or was there a great cleavage

between Palestinian and non-Palestinian Judaism (in the west), which goes some way toward explaining Paul's revulsion against the law and its interpretation in the synagogue (either in Palestine or in the western Diaspora)?

Belkin's study is therefore of great interest and importance for the interpretation of the New Testament. Almost every page contains something relevant either to gospels or epistles, or to both.

His general conclusion is that "the Alexandrian Jewish community which lived among a Greek-speaking population borrowed a great deal from its neighbors; but at the same time it is quite certain that there existed a great interdependency of thought between the Alexandrian and Palestinian Jewish communities and that we cannot regard them as two entirely separate forms of Judaism. Alexandrian Jewry, which remained steadfastly loyal to the practices of Judaism within a foreign and hostile environment, was willing to undergo all the inconveniences these practices must have inevitably involved, not because of the Greek philosophical ideas themselves, but because of the strong and vital hold which traditional practices had upon the lives of the people" (pp. vii-viii). "The Oral Law which originated in Palestine was not limited to the borders of Palestine, but was also known and practiced among the Jews who lived outside of Palestine, and . . . Philo's Halakah is based upon the Palestinian Oral Law as it was known in Alexandria" (p. x). "On the whole [Philo] follows Pharisaic principles, except that the severity of the penalties he imposes regarding capital punishment is in agreement with the Sadducean policy" (p. 10).

If this be true, then the assumed influence of Graeco-Roman legal principles and procedure upon Philo must be largely discounted—for it is certainly more probable that Philo drew from Jewish sources than from pagan (p. 19). Moreover, Josephus's alleged dependence upon Philo rests upon insecure grounds (p. 42); Belkin draws a sharp contrast between the two men, to the advantage of the latter.

The legal principles and terms studied cover the full range of Philo's expositions of the Mosaic Law: the temple ritual, priesthood, civil and criminal law, oaths and vows, the judiciary, the calendar, the family, and sexual morality.

If Professor Belkin's case is proved (and to a non-expert in Jewish law it seems wholly convincing), Christian students of the Bible and especially of the New Testament must take the principle into full account. It is no longer legitimate to draw a sharp line between Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism, at least in their attitude toward and application of the Oral Law; and this makes considerable difference in the discussion of the subject as reflected in the gospels (which are 'Hellenistic' books based upon Palestinian traditions) and—especially—as reflected and presupposed in Paul. Recent American work upon Philo (the various studies by Moore, Goodenough, Goodhart, Belkin, and others) and the publication of the new Loeb *Philo* have opened up a wholly new vista in New Testament research, one that is of extreme interest and importance.

FREDERICK C. GRANT

The Church of England. By Herbert Hensley Henson. New York: Macmillan, 1939, pp. xvi + 264. Ill. \$2.50.

This is the second in a series on English Institutions, under the editorship of Lord Stamp. Those who are acquainted with the earlier writings of the retired Bishop of Durham are aware that he is a man of strong and highly individual convictions, which he knows how to present forcefully and defend vigorously. They will expect to encounter an uncompromising assertion of the essentially Protestant character of the Church of England as a Reformed church, and a corresponding lack of sympathy with Anglo-Catholicism as tending to destroy this character. This antipathy comes out in the Bishop's discussion of such matters as the Articles of Religion, liturgical lawlessness, and, of course, reunion.

Dr. Henson tells us that he has prepared a *Speculum Ecclesiae*. But his book can hardly be regarded as objective, even while it is not unfair. It evaluates and judges—often adversely—as well as reflects. One fears that the image is conditioned—if not distorted—by the Bishop's face in the background. Doubtless this element of provocativeness makes it the better reading.

Bishop Henson realizes that an institution so venerable and so contradictory as the Church of England can be understood only when seen in the light of its history. His incisive Historical Introduction begins:

The Church of England as it now exists is the most enigmatic and baffling of the national institutions. It is the very embodiment of paradox. Theoretically it is the Church of the English nation; actually its effective membership is claimed by no more than a petty fraction of the citizens. It is a reformed Church, but it refuses fellowship with all other reformed churches with the partial exception of the Church of Sweden. It is at once the most authoritative, and the least disciplined of all Protestant churches, the proudest in corporate pretension, the feeblest in corporate power.

What follows is largely commentary upon this text, dealing with such subjects as the anomalous nature of the Establishment under present conditions, doctrinal restatement in a liberal direction to preserve the traditional Anglican devotion to sound learning, the ethics of clerical subscription, the position and prestige of the episcopate, the personnel and quality of the parish clergy, the scandals of patronage and parson's freehold, education, relations with other churches. Much of this, so integral to the Church in the mother-land, is *terra incognita* to American Churchmen, to whom Erastianism is just another word.

During the last century the Establishment has been gradually 'transformed' by the creation of the Ecclesiastical Commission to manage its endowments, by the revival of Convocation, the Lambeth Conferences, and the Church Assembly measure of 1919. Of these four, only the first draws Dr. Henson's unqualified approval.

On the whole, the book is colored by a somberness which some people would construe as pessimism, but which the author would doubtless call realism born of experience. Very likely another pen could have given us a brighter and more smiling image; but few this side the Atlantic are qualified to judge.

P. V. NORWOOD

The Sacrament of Reunion. By Cyril Charles Richardson. New York: Scribner, 1940, pp. x + 120. \$1.25.

In this little book an Episcopalian, a scholarly representative of the liberal Evangelical position, now serving on the faculty of Union Seminary, comes to the aid of the embattled Proposed Concordat between the Presbyterian and Episcopal churches. Dr. Richardson ably argues that the divided state of Christendom—the co-existence of varying types of organization and ordination—demands altogether new procedures if reunion is to be achieved. A new 'sacrament of reunion' must be created; and the 'extended ordination' contemplated by the Concordat is precisely such a sacrament. Indeed, one may think that, acting on the mandate implied in the solemn declaration by the two churches of their 'purpose to achieve organic union,' the Joint Commission could hardly have done otherwise than formulate something akin to the present Concordat, subject, obviously, to improvement in detail and phraseology. For a purpose to unite amounts to nothing unless implemented by concrete proposals which have some prospect of effecting union. It may be that the declaration was premature and not sufficiently considered. Certainly, reunion likely to result in three churches in the place of two would be bought at too high a price.

Such a book as this must of necessity devote much space to the doctrine and early history of the ministry. Dr. Richardson distinguishes properly between the little we really *know* about the first stages in the development of the ministry and what we *guess* about them. Some 'guesses' are justifiable inferences from the scanty data, with some measure of probability; others are assumptions of faith without warrant in fact. It is admitted that the conservative Anglo-Catholic ('Tractarian') doctrine is consistent and invulnerable on its premises. But our author denies that these premises are either historically sound or approved in the official teaching of the Anglican Communion as set forth in its formularies. He makes constant, and on his own premises effective, appeal to the Reformers and the Reformation as against the Carolines, and their modern representatives. He points out that Anglican practice has—at least at times—implied the validity of the ministries of non-episcopal Reformed churches, and that the formularies on a fair construction have never repudiated them. Yet he is forced to admit that as late as 1934 the Church of England declined to give explicit recognition to the Orders of the Church of Scotland.

Apostolic Succession is an act of faith rather than a matter of historical fact. Yet it is a doctrine 'in which historical facts are essential if the act of faith is to be meaningful.' Dr. Richardson weighs the doctrine in the balance of objective historical judgment—and finds it wanting. The statement in the Preface to the Ordinal is dismissed as 'misleading if not historically untrue' (p. 57). We are given the impression that *no* present-day scholarship worthy of the name would presume to defend it. Which seems to be some slight exaggeration!

So far as the appeal to history is involved, Richardson is doubtless nearer the truth than the champions of divine-right episcopacy. In his attempt to dispose of the prescriptive title acquired by fourteen hundred years of possession

he is less successful. After all, the English Church has always professed to be something more than one member in the family of Reformed churches—distinguished from the others simply by the circumstance that, for reasons of no particular theological significance, she has retained the historic episcopate. If she has not in fact invalidated Presbyterian Orders, she has clearly never regarded them as sufficient.

Did the Anglican Reformation involve a thoroughgoing and final doctrinal re-orientation of *Ecclesia Anglicana*, to bring it into alignment with the continental Reformed churches? English Reformers can be quoted at length to support this thesis. Or was it but an episode—and in some respects an unfortunate one that we would like to forget—in the long life of the English Church? Upon this the Anglo-Catholic, whether conservative or liberal, is bound to insist as the seventeenth-century divines did before him. Before we can hope to make much progress with reunion we shall have—as a Church—to reach a decision here. Our failure to do so heretofore is responsible for the indictment that “Anglicanism . . . has had a peculiar talent for originating schemes for Church unity and then proving itself to be the main obstacle in their fulfillment” (p. 32).

No less fundamental, and in the long run perhaps more formidable, than the issue between ‘parity’ and three-fold ministry is that with respect to priesthood. Does an Apostolic ministry involve *sacerdotium*? If so, in what sense? And in what sense does the Anglican system retain priesthood? Dr. Richardson seems to be unaware of the magnitude of these questions in practical discussions around the Concordat. He has, indeed, a chapter on the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, in which he attempts to make Anglican and Presbyterian formularies speak the same language, without raising the question how far our present consciousness corresponds to the formulas of other days. He fails, furthermore, to deal with the technical theological meaning of the term ‘Real Presence,’ and rests content with setting it in antithesis to ‘an imaginary vision that we conjure up’ (p. 78), and remarking upon the ‘real difference’ between the ‘so-called Catholic [in which he would presumably include the Lutheran] views on the one hand, and the Anglican and Presbyterian views on the other’ (p. 90).

If the Reformation is to be set in the foreground, Prof. Richardson’s argument is for the most part cogent and compelling. Just here, however, the disciples of the ‘Tractarians’ have developed, for obvious reasons, a convenient blind-spot or mental block. While the book is hardly likely to convince anybody who has already made ‘prior acts of faith’ in the other direction, it is to be wished that all Deputies to the General Convention would take a couple of hours this summer to read it without undue prejudice, for it is indeed highly informative. And let them reflect that “a Church unity which comprehends *more than one religion* (italics mine) would seem to be as meaningless as it is dangerous” (p. 7).

P. V. NORWOOD

Our Knowledge of God. By John Baillie. New York: Scribner, 1939, pp. ix + 263. \$2.50.

During the last few years, Prof. Baillie, of the University of Edinburgh, has exposed himself to the continental theologians. Out of this experience has come a refinement and a change in his fundamental theological outlook, but he has in no sense become a slave to that which was instrumental in bringing about his growth. In this beautifully written essay, he presents the results of this experience in the form of a modern apologetic for belief in God.

His main purpose is expressed in a quotation from Prof. Cook Wilson, "The true business of philosophy is to bring belief to a consciousness of itself" (p. 50). We must realize that none of us is entirely free from God. While Dr. Barth would say that "the image of God impressed upon man at creation is, as it were, a purely archeological fact" (p. 22), it is more true to say that "there is in man no *nature* apart from revelation. Human nature is constituted by the self-disclosure to this poor dust of the Spirit of the living God" (p. 41). Man is always confronted by God, and it is usually the case "that the believer finds *God* in experiences which the unbeliever would equally claim to have had, but which seem to him susceptible of a purely humanistic or naturalistic interpretation" (p. 53). Even when one denies God "with the top of his mind," he really believes in God in his innermost being.

We do not know God through argument or inference, but only in conjunction with ourselves, our fellows, and the corporeal world. We know him not in the world but with the world; we know him through the service of our fellows; and we know him in history, which "means, lastly, the necessity of Christ, God incarnate in the flesh" (p. 180). This is a "mediated immediacy." We know God through the Bible and Christ. And because we know God through Christ, our knowledge is a *veiled* knowledge. We know God only as a *person*, and therefore as *subject* and not as object. This is the reason continental theologians object to empiricism, for by "experience" they mean experience of a thing, while we know God only by coming into *relation* with him. It is an "I-Thou" and not an "I-it" experience. God is a subject, although in a secondary sense He is objective. Furthermore, we must not be too hasty in denying the immanence of God. God and man do not stand absolutely over against each other, for "*God appears in some sort to be present on both sides of the relationship*" (p. 234—italics Baillie's).

This is a book which has been desperately needed, for it takes the best thoughts of the continental tradition and of Thomism and blends them into the Scotch tradition. Because it is so convincing and important, it may seem gratuitous to offer criticism; but it is my feeling that Prof. Baillie has proved too much. If all men can have knowledge of God by interpreting their experiences (or relationships) properly, Prof. Baillie has re-asserted the major tenets of natural theology. Man can by himself come to God, with God's help. Are Christ and the Bible, then, absolutely necessary? Is there not an immediacy which need not be mediated?

Furthermore, in his attacks on Dr. Box's theory of analogy, he sets up a form of the ontological argument which is more open to criticism than that of

St. Anselm. "He who knows the poverty of his own personality knows it only because there has first been revealed to him the perfect personality of God" (p. 251). If we can think of perfection, God must be perfect—and so for all the other attributes we can conceive. Is it not more nearly the truth that we come to our conclusions concerning the attributes of God on the basis of analogy from our common human experiences?

Finally, Dr. Baillie is not clear as to how this knowledge of God is to be tested. For while he makes our knowledge of God the result of a direct relationship, his approach to empiricism through the eyes of Dr. Buber blinds him to the tests of truth provided by the broad type of empiricism developed by American theologians. So while his whole argument for revelation (like Archbishop Temple's) builds up the expectation that we can know God in experience, he falls back in the end on the Bible and the record of Christ found *there*, which is not personal experience or relationship after all, but only the record of it.

In spite of these criticisms, Prof. Baillie presents an integrated system of thought which combines the best offerings of Germany, of modern Thomism, and of Anglicanism, and his book cannot be ignored by anyone who desires to gain discriminating insight into man's knowledge of God.

RANDOLPH CRUMP MILLER

Luthers Glaubensbegriff. Gottesgabe und Menschentat in ihrer Polarität. By Fritz Frey. Leipzig: Leopold Klotz, 1939, pp. 154. Price: R.M. 6.

The theme and motive of this work are accurately designated by the title. It is really a commentary throughout upon Seeberg's important dictum, that 'the leverage of Luther's reformatory principle lies . . . in the conviction that faith is the form of true religion.' The author believes however that hitherto the 'Luther-investigation' has failed to follow through in all its implications for the correct understanding of the first Reformer, the centrality of faith in his experience and interpretation of Christianity. *Luthers Glaubensbegriff* represents an attempt to remedy this failure and to advance from a new angle the modern investigation of Luther. To this end Pfarrer Frey has not only labored diligently upon the original sources (using the Weimar edition). He seems also to have mastered the principal results to date of the research upon Luther. His sketches of the theses of such authorities as Holl, both Seebergs, von Loewenich, Kattenbusch, Hirsch, etc. are especially valuable. At the close of the work an extremely thorough classified bibliography is provided.

Frey's special thesis is indicated by the subtitle 'God's gift and man's deed in their polarity.' Elsewhere he uses frequently the word 'tension' to bring out the relation between the two aspects of faith. It is primarily God's gift. Frey does not deny Luther's anti-humanistic and anti-libertarian bias. But there is a manward, an active, an heroic side. Faith is also something man does. It is a deed of courage, of holding on to God in temptations, adversities, the onslaughts of the powers of Satan in the world. It is this decisive act of faith, which is at once the work of the Holy Spirit and man's deed, that justifies. God reveals himself through faith as gracious and good. Man's life by the same token receives a new centre; it is hid with Christ in God. But this is a

continuous process, not something accomplished at one moment or period of time. Therefore, faith in its fundamental tension remains throughout life the form of true religion, the mode of the only real relation of God to the soul.

From this angle, Frey thinks, light is shed upon Luther's conception of God—the problem which offers the greatest difficulty in the investigation of Luther. The puzzle of the relation between *deus absconditus* and *deus revelatus* becomes less intractable. The general bearing of Luther's later intense emphasis upon Satan and his Kingdom is clarified. His special interest in Christology and even the doctrine of ubiquity fit into the total picture.

Such suggestions, which have in view the problem of the ultimate unity of Luther's thought, are subordinate to the development of the main theme and are not put forward in connection with any excessively ambitious claims. In this way an admirable balance is struck between a special object of research and the general bearing of the results reached. The reviewer has no hesitation in saying that *Luthers Glaubensbegriff* is a work of exceptional interest which no serious student of Luther will wish to neglect.

CHARLES W. LOWRY, JR.

The Flowering of Mysticism: The Friends of God in the Fourteenth Century.

By Rufus M. Jones. New York: Macmillan, 1939, pp. 270. \$2.50.

Any discussion by Dr. Rufus Jones of mysticism deserves and receives an enthusiastic welcome. In *The Flowering of Mysticism* Dr. Jones brings forth the fruit of a life-long labor, and realizes a hope of his earliest days as a student. He presents in this book the great outpouring of mystical waters in the fourteenth century. Welling up from currents of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it burst forth in flood tide with Eckhart, found broad channels in the "Friends of God" of the Rhineland, with concurrent springs in England, and flowed on, directed by Gerard Groote, into the Brethren of the Common Life Movement. A great "friend of God" himself, Dr. Jones has offered a lucid and dependable guide to a religious literature which only recently has received deserved attention by English and American scholars. Dr. Jones modestly states that Miss A. G. Seesholtz's recent work (*The Friends of God; Practical Mystics of the Fourteenth Century*, New York, 1934) might have absolved him from his "silent pledge of youth." We are happy that it has not. The two books complement one another.

Much of the material of the book has already been examined by Dr. Jones in his *Studies in Mystical Religion*, published thirty years ago. Except in details of historical and literary criticism there is little in his fresh interpretation that is changed. The new book gives more detailed treatment of Tauler's authentic writings; interprets Suso in less ponderous vein as "a minnesinger" among mystics; and gives larger place to some of the women mystics, both Continental and English, including Margery Kempe, whose "Book" was discovered in entirety as late as 1934. Dr. Jones now believes that Gerard Groote was the "original author of the most important part" of *The Imitation of Christ*. A Kempis, only a compiler, is absolved, however, from any sin of plagiarism. To note a few minor points—Eckhart's Christian name was

Johannes, not Heinrich; and Ruysbroeck was not "untrained and unlearned," as has been the traditional view.

Without detracting from the great merit of Dr. Jones' book, one might wish that the present volume, representing the labors of a lifetime, were more thorough-going in its analyses of the thought of the great mystics. In this respect, his earlier studies will still need to be consulted. Two points in particular, the reviewer felt, could have been given more attention. Dr. Jones discounts heartily any view of the mystics which would make them precursors of the Protestant Reformation, and insists over and over again upon their loyalty to the Catholic Church. Yet he has not presented very much in the way of references or quotations to explain their respective attitudes towards the hierarchy and the sacramental life of the Church. And this leads to the other point of criticism. It is admitted that the mystical movement of the fourteenth century was in great part a response to the social and religious conditions of the age. The reader, however, does not receive any very clear notion of this relationship, because so little attention is given to the social backgrounds of religion in the fourteenth century. The survey of "forerunners" is good and necessary; but it is not altogether adequate for an understanding of why "the flowering of mysticism" came in the fourteenth, rather than, say, the thirteenth century of St. Francis and St. Thomas.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

The Philosophy of Communism. By Charles J. McFadden. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1939, pp. xx + 345. \$3.50.

This book falls into two parts; the first is devoted to a general and well rounded exposition of the entire Marxist philosophy. Without going into the intricate details of the Marxian analysis of commodities, money, surplus value, wages, accumulation of capital, etc., as they are found in *Das Kapital*, Dr. McFadden sets forth the Communistic theory of material dialectic as it explains nature, mind and history; then their teaching on the state, its economic system, its religion and morals as they are explained on the basis of economic determinism, which is simply an extension and application of the same general principle of dialectical materialism. This statement of the Communist philosophy is based on an imposing bibliography of works by accepted Communist authorities; and it is so clear and impartial that I believe it would be acceptable even to the party members themselves.

The second half of the book takes up each topic, and point by point offers a criticism and refutation based mainly on scholastic philosophy. Thus, for example, to the Marxist's materialistic explanation of the world there is opposed the doctrine of a transcendent Intelligence and Prime Mover, i.e. God; and to their anthropological account of the natural origin of religion is opposed the teaching of a divinely revealed religion. The theory of the economic determination of history and the state is criticised for its over simplification and opposed by a sounder philosophical conception of mind, free will, and the part they play in human affairs.

But while emphasizing the inconsistencies and falsities of the Communistic

philosophy, this book at the same time quite candidly recognizes the validity of certain particular points made by Communism. For instance Christianity agrees (or shall we say, should agree?) with Communism in demanding the eradication of exploitation from society, in condemning the abuse of economic power, and in denouncing the various misuses of state power which work social injustice. The inadequate nature of the reforms demanded by the Communist revolution are exposed in contrasting them with the revolution which Christianity proposes to work in man and society.

LEWIS M. HAMMOND

Social Religion. By W. C. MacIntosh. New York: Scribner, 1939, pp. xv + 336. \$3.00.

In this book Dr. MacIntosh has provided a brilliant and timely discussion of the social teaching of Jesus and its application to some of the pressing social problems of the present day. The opening chapters study Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom of God with special attention to what Jesus has to say about the law of love and the use of force. The central ethical problem, as the author sees it, is the problem of living in an imperfect world in terms of an absolute ideal. He refers to Niebuhr's attempt to solve this problem by means of the theory that the ideals of Jesus are "relevant but impossible" and points out that Niebuhr's doctrine suffers from a fundamental lack of clearness. He discusses the now familiar concept of interim ethics and suggests that the meaning of this phrase be turned around to indicate that while there is an absolute law for the Kingdom of God, in view of the present imperfection in the world certain things, like the use of force for instance, may be necessary and therefore right in the "interim" before the Kingdom comes which would not be either necessary nor right in the Kingdom. "This is the interim ethic which results from the union of an enlightened conscience, a loving heart and a dedicated will with common sense."

The second part of the book discusses the prevention of war, the abolition of poverty, the safeguarding of liberty and the reformation of government in terms of the ideals of Jesus and at the same time with complete realism and a very clear appreciation of the practical difficulties involved. Dr. MacIntosh was born in Canada and was refused United States citizenship in 1931 by a decision of the United States Supreme Court because he would not pledge himself to take up arms if necessary in defense of this country. This experience colors the closing chapters of the book. But though this experience was a bitter one it is discussed with an objectiveness and an effort to understand both sides of the question which afford a living example of the kind of Christian spirit Dr. MacIntosh is talking about in this book.

C. L. STREET

This Holy Fellowship. By E. R. Hardy and W. N. Pittinger. New York: Morehouse-Gorham, 1939, pp. 228. \$2.50.

Now here's a book which a bishop of today can give to his ordinands with the assurance that they will read it and find it helpful.

To be sure the chapters are not all of equal value—how could they be since they are written by various persons with varying gifts? Nevertheless each writer holds to his subject and avoids the pitfalls alike of pedantry and juvenilism. The treated problems are precisely those which every clergyman must face and the advice given is simple, direct, and sound.

For example Dr. Hardy writing on 'The Sacred Liturgy' keeps a fine balance between the ideal of Christian worship and practical suggestions of how to proceed toward the realization of those ideals with wisdom and patient common sense. And he is simple and sensible in his treatment of liturgical art and ceremonial.

The chapter on 'The Music of the Parish Church' is one which should be read by a Rector and Choirmaster together, and then paragraph by paragraph presented to the congregation in a series of instructions musically illustrated.

And so it goes. One could speak with equal enthusiasm of every one of these short, direct, helpful essays—all of them written by young men 'educated since 1914-18.' "All are young and for that reason perhaps brash," say the editors. If that be so, then the brasher the better for these messages have more than weight: they have lift. They are not merely two-dimensional, for they have height as well as length, and breadth. At the close of each chapter is a valuable list of books for suggested reading.

The late Dr. Gavin to whose blessed memory they are dedicated would, I believe, rejoice in the work of these his pupils.

And it should be added that laity will like the book, or should, just as much as the clergy.

G. CRAIG STEWART

NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

Biblical, Historical

The Drama of our Religion. By A. G. Baldwin. New York: Oxford University Press, 1940, pp. x + 247. \$1.80.

More than ten years ago, Bishop Talbot of Pretoria wrote *A Biblical Thoroughfare* as a help towards the understanding of the Bible by laymen who knew some Bible stories and perhaps could even enumerate the plagues of Egypt but did not know what the Bible as a whole was about; this book is an attempt to do the same thing in terms that secondary school students can understand. It would also be useful to those numerous College students who probably know less of Christianity than of any other religion—and often what they do know is wrong. "It is," to quote the Introduction, "a study of early Hebrew History and the beginning of Christianity and deals with the main ideas and ideals of each period against the background of economic and political change." Each chapter is preceded by a note on the contemporary events in world history, e.g. Amos was attacking the religious and social evils of his time at about the date of the founding of Rome. A book for popular use should be more accurate than one intended for the learned and it was not the Temple party "who wanted to hurl themselves against the Roman armies" in the time of Christ. A privileged group is not eager for change. Nor was the claim to be the Messiah in itself considered blasphemy; nor was it Christ's enemies who asked the question, "What think ye of Christ; whose son is he?"

A. H. F.

The Common People of Pompeii. A Study of the Graffiti. By Helen H. Tanner. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1939, pp. xii + 113. \$3.00.

The writing on the wall spelled the doom of Babylon, but the doom of Pompeii preserved the writings on the walls and from these the author attempts to reconstruct the life of the common people. There are about fifteen thousand inscriptions available, so that it is not surprising to find that someone wrote with a plaintive lack of logic, 'Everybody writes on the walls but me.' As well as inscriptions, the book contains numerous illustrations: an ass millstone is mentioned in St. Mark's Gospel and there is a picture of an ass mill on the walls of Pompeii, asses and all; idol meat was a problem to the Christians of Corinth in St. Paul's day, the *popinae* of Pompeii, the places where meat left over from sacrifices was sold, had a bad reputation and it seems that the butchers actually assisted the priests at the sacrifices. It is not often that a study in archaeology has so many 'human interests' touches as this little book.

A. H. F.

Explorations in Eastern Palestine, III. The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Vols. xviii-xix. By Nelson Glueck. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1939, pp. xxiv + 288, 22 plates. \$2.50.

With this volume the American Schools of Oriental Research complete their survey of Edom and Moab. As in the two previous volumes the author's ability to make a scholarly report interesting to the informed layman is very marked.

To the Biblical student this series of reports on the civilization of the eastern neighbors of Israel and Judah should be of absorbing interest, revealing as it does their parallel development and crises. While such surveys as this continue it becomes more and more clear that Palestinian isolation, so long subject to suspicion by the scholar, has been far more a matter of information than of reality.

A. D. A., JR.

The Descent of the Dove. By Charles Williams. New York: Oxford University Press, 1940, pp. ix + 245. \$2.50.

"The conversion of time by the Holy Ghost" (p. 15) might seem a fitting subtitle for this work, but, as a matter of fact, references to the Holy Ghost and His work are infrequent; rather the recurring theme is the Ignatian "My Eros is crucified," and there are occasional allusions to sex-relationships which are not at all clear. The work is not marked by depth of penetration or by breadth of study, but by freshness of presentation with many striking sentences: e.g. "It is at least arguable that the Christian Church will have to return to a pre-Constantine state before she can properly recover the ground she too quickly won" (p. 86). Accuracy of statement sometimes suffers; no one who had read De Labriolle's great works on Montanism could regard it as favorably as does the present author; nor could one who had adequate knowledge of the subject speak of the acceptance of confessors as priests apart from ordination (p. 42); St. Jerome was not "collating the Vulgate . . . by the end of the third century" (p. 78); Newman was not received into the Roman Church in 1848 (p. 214). Such errors may be the almost inevitable defects of the qualities of the book. The author does succeed in compacting a surprisingly large amount of detail in small space, dealing with the history of the Church from New Testament days to the present time, and writes with almost complete objectivity; balance is well kept throughout the long course, except, perhaps, for an overstressing of the significance of Kierkegaard towards the end of the work.

F. H. H.

Doctrinal

Protestantism's Challenge. By Conrad H. Moehlman. New York: Harper, 1939, pp. 286. \$2.50.

This book deals with a host of questions whose answers, the author believes, are fundamental to the problem of a united, effective Christian Church. What are the historical facts behind doctrinal positions? Can churches which emphasize sacraments find a basis for union with those which do not? What are

the major discoveries of scholars about the New Testament? These are some of the questions with which the author deals. The general thesis of the book is summed up by Dr. Moehlman in these words, "Original Protestantism desired to return to Jesus. It failed to work this miracle because the essential historical data and method were not available. Now, at last, Protestantism may know at least approximately what Jesus thought of God, of man, of the better community, of the good life, and by taking his ideals seriously accept the challenge it has constructed for itself by living in such a large way in the area of medieval rather than original Christianity."

The author demands that the Protestant world be courageous enough to face the facts which the assured results of historico-scientific criticism of the inherited Protestant faith have made certain. If Dr. Moehlman is correct in his presentation of the certainties of scholarship, this will indeed take courage or it will mean the jettisoning of a huge amount of traditional faith and practice and the necessity of being content with a simple religion of ethical idealism. However, there will be many who will question whether scholarship is so certain as Dr. Moehlman thinks it is. Though there is much in the book with which the present reviewer must disagree, it is tremendously stimulating throughout and should be read by all who care deeply about Christianity. P. S. K.

The Framework of Faith. By Leslie Simmonds. New York: Longmans, 1939, pp. xvi + 262. \$2.50.

This is the first volume of a series of six on "The Teaching of the Church" whose general editor is Canon Roger Lloyd of Winchester. The aim of the series is to cover at least in outline the ground which the evangelist of today will find is the ground on which he must give battle.

If the succeeding volumes keep to the high level established by this first volume, they will make a genuine and welcome contribution to Christian apologetics for today. Granted there is nothing new or startling here in the presentation of Christian doctrine, there is distinctly an up-to-date approach to those fundamentals of the faith which many reject because they appear to them to be intellectually obsolete. But there is no watering down, no compromise with unbelief. The style is lucid, simple, direct and the presentation logical and compelling. The existence of God, His nature through general and special revelation, the nature of man, the revelation of God to Israel and to the Gentiles, God-made-man, Redemption, the Resurrection, Ascension and Session, the Church, Man's final destiny—these are the chapters of the first volume and every page invites and deserves close reading.

If it be true, as Cardinal Manning once said—and I believe it is true—that every human problem is at base a theological problem, then both clergy and laity will do well to get their theology in clear terms. And it will not do just to pull down from the shelves the well-thumbed volumes of a generation ago and even of a decade ago. The world of physical science and of social science, of psychology and of psychiatry records tremendous changes and advances. And these very changes open the doors for the presentation of the great eternal truths of Christianity. But they must be introduced by those who know where

the doors are situated and how to make an entrance without slipping on the threshold.

We have greatly enjoyed the first of the series, and we shall eagerly watch for those which follow after.

G. C. S.

Bekenntnis und Sakrament: ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der christlichen Konfessionen. Teil I. *Über die treibenden Kräfte in der Bekenntnissentwicklung der abendländischen Kirche bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters.* By Wilhelm Maurer. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1939, pp. vi + 124.

A careful and well documented study of the evolution of the Christian creed and confessions, dominated by the conviction that underlying all creedal differences an abiding unity is to be traced, since the creed has its origin in the Church's spontaneous response of faith and love and loyalty to the self-revelation of Christ. From the beginning this response has had its centre in the sacramental life of the Church, the Body Mystical; has had as its motivation the will of the Body to express ever more adequately the truth as it is in its Head. More and more the Western Church fell under the dominion of law (Rudolf Sohm) and the once spontaneous confession became increasingly legally conditioned, this didactic, juridic conception of the creed developing *pari passu* with the Catholic Church's procedure against heresy as rebellion against the Body, and so against the Head.

The Preface is dated *am Westwall*, in the opening days of the war.

F. V. N.

Practical Theology

Their Future is Now. By Ernest M. Ligon. New York: Macmillan, 1939, pp. xv + 369. \$3.00.

Those who read *The Psychology of Christian Personality* will welcome this new book by Dr. Ligon. It carries on where the earlier book left off and is a study of a technique for developing the type of Christian character discussed in that book. Those who read *The Psychology of Christian Personality* will recognize some familiar ideas: the conviction that religion, to meet human needs, must make for mental health and the wholesome all-around development of personality, and the conviction that the Christian religion properly interpreted does just this; the stress on fatherly love as a more fruitful concept than brotherly love by which to interpret the meaning of Christian love; the analysis of character based on eight traits derived from the beatitudes—vision, love of righteousness and truth, faith in the friendliness of the universe, dominating purpose, sensitiveness to the need of others, forgiveness, magnanimity, and Christian courage.

This book is based on experimental studies made in connection with Westminster Presbyterian Church of Albany, New York. It takes children at different age levels from early infancy to maturity and discusses the characteristics of the different stages in the child's development and the educational technique appropriate for each age level. There is considerable stress on individual differences and some rather elaborate questionnaires to be used in

the study of individual children. It makes a real contribution to a Christian philosophy of education, and at the same time is sufficiently practical so that it will be of great value to workers in religious education.

C. L. S.

Lift Up Your Hearts. By Walter Russell Bowie. New York: Macmillan, 1939, pp. viii + 118. \$1.25.

All Christians need constant exercise in the devotional life. One of the best methods of providing for this is the preparation of a book like this. By the combined beauty and naturalness of expression the author gives us a most useful guide in the Christian's prayer life. It should be especially useful in training confirmation and communicant classes in the 'how' of prayer.

F. A. M.

The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day. By Karl Barth. New York: Scribner, pp. 87. \$1.00.

This book is a plea for Christians to think through the religious implications of National Socialism and, having done so, to express their beliefs openly and to put their beliefs to the test of action. Whether or not one agrees with the necessity of expressing this action in war just as Europe once arrayed itself against the Turk, one must acknowledge the clearness of the author's statement of the irrepressible conflict between Christianity and the Totalitarian State.

F. A. M.

Which Way Democracy? By Wilfred Parsons, S.J. Macmillan, 1939, pp. 295. \$2.00.

The writer of this excellent little book is professor of Political Science at Georgetown University, and Dean of the Graduate School. For years he was editor-in-chief of *America* and is recognized as an outstanding scholar in his field. He is deeply convinced that only in our democratic form of government do we find in modern conditions the full flowering of justice among men, and that only from religion as from a source has this democratic government ever drawn its strength and meaning. Chapters I to III include a trenchant diagnosis of the ills of the present world. Chapters IV to VI examine the principles of democracy according to Roman Catholic traditions. Chapters VII to IX represent an application of these principles to our American problem; while the concluding chapter summarizes and synthesizes the whole problem of the modern world and proposes the solution.

Seldom have we read a book more thoughtful and incisive. Free from rhetorical bombast and old clichés reminiscent of Fourth of July speeches, this treatment of democracy and its necessary foundation in religion is one of the soundest we have ever seen. It is not a big book in size or bulk, but it is a very big book in sheer thinking. We recommend it to readers of every faith and of no faith at all, in confidence that they will find it profitable.

G. C. S.